

The Philanthropist.

JAMES G. BIRNEY,

We are verily guilty concerning our brother... therefore, is this distress come upon us.

[EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.]

VOLUME 1.

NEW-RICHMOND, OHIO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1836.

NUMBER 3.

THE PHILANTHROPIST

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT
NEW-RICHMOND, CLERMONT CO., OHIO.

Terms.

Two Dollars per annum, always payable in ADVANCE.
All Letters and Communications must be post-paid—and should be directed to the Editor of the Philanthropist. Names of the Counties particularly should be mentioned in directing where papers are to be sent.
An Advertisement making one square or a space of equal length and breadth, will be inserted three times for One Dollar.

Slave-Holder's Department.

EXTRACT FROM GOVERNOR LUMPKIN'S MESSAGE.

These general remarks have been made with a view to the existing state of things between the slave and non-slaveholding States; a delicate subject, which nothing but an imperious sense of duty could induce me to introduce to public consideration, in a paper of this character. The constitutional rights, of the southern States, in regard to slave property, is not, and cannot be controverted; and I feel disposed to cherish an abiding confidence in the virtue and patriotism of our northern brethren—and will not indulge the belief, that the great body of that people, can, for a moment, countenance and encourage the desperate efforts of those violent incendiaries who are laboring to stir up insurrection and rebellion in the southern States. Should, however, the abolitionists be permitted to proceed without molestation—or only have to encounter the weapons of reason and argument, have we not reason to fear, that their untiring efforts may succeed in misleading the majority of a people, having no direct interest in the great question at issue, and finally produce an interference with the constitutional rights of the slaveholder? The consequences of such an event cannot be contemplated, by the patriot, without the most painful emotions. The success of these misguided men would be destructive of all that is desirable in the glorious experimental government under which we are enjoying an unparalleled degree of happiness and prosperity. No adequate conception can be formed of the blessings which they are laboring to destroy, while they claim to be the exclusive friends of liberty and freedom. The principles of the Christian religion can never be brought to the aid of these monsters, whose proceedings are marked by the most reckless, blood-thirsty spirit that ever disgraced the American name. Upon this subject, we can hear no argument. Our opinions are unalterably fixed—our determinations are immutably firm and steadfast, and therefore ought not to be concealed or misunderstood. It is a subject with which we cannot suffer a stranger to intermeddle. But the question arises, What is to be done in the present emergency? It is the imperative duty of the people and governments of the several States, where these incendiaries are engaged in their diabolical plans and operations, to put them down, at once, and forever. It is not my province, or duty, to point out the manner in which public opinion should be brought to bear on this subject; whether by legislation or otherwise, must be left to the wisdom of the people of those States who are in duty bound to act, and to act promptly and efficiently upon this subject. If the States in which these enemies of our peace reside, do not, without delay, manifest their friendship and fidelity to the Constitution and the Union of the States, by effectually silencing these incendiaries, we can no longer be called upon, in charity, to place any confidence in their professions so often promulgated to the world. It is, with us, a subject of deep and solemn import—involving the destiny of our dearest domestic affections—our sacred altars—our all.

I would earnestly recommend to the consideration of the legislature, the revision of our existing laws, so as more effectually to prevent the circulation, through the post-office or otherwise, of any publications tending to endanger our domestic relations, or calling in question our constitutional rights of property. Congress should also be invoked, in the most earnest and respectful language, not to suffer the post-office establishment to be used to our injury and destruction. I would also recommend that the States, where these agitators and incendiaries are found, should be called upon in the true spirit of our institutions, that is, in a spirit of manly independence and brotherly affection, to sustain, in good faith, the letter and spirit of our glorious Constitution.

"THE PEOPLE OF THE SOUTH DESIRE TO BE RID OF SLAVERY."

Such is the opinion which has been industriously and mischievously propagated at the north. Under this delusion, the friends of humanity have folded their hands, closed their lips, and left their outraged brother to the tender mercies of his oppressor. "Let us be still," it has been said, "and cultivate, by a kind and soothing intercourse, the confidence and good will of the master—doubtless he will as soon as is consistent with the safety of all parties, do the thing that is right." We have been told, too, that the masters would gladly free their slaves, if they could only be taken out of the country.

Generation after generation has descended to the grave, and all the while this grand experiment of keeping still has been going on; and what is the result? The chains are heavier; the hammer moves more briskly; ignorance is more profound and brutish; and slavery is regarded as the settled constitutional policy of the country—venerable for its age—unchangeable—eternal! Are slaveholders softened? Are they more regardful of our wishes, and our common honor? No! They meet the first lip of advice and entreaty as an unwarrantable interference; they storm and rave, and disgrace our republic with language fit only for the worst days of Caligula and Domitian. Have they taken one step by way of "preparation for freedom"—one step in sixty years? No: they unblushingly proclaim that SLAVERY SHALL BE FOREVER!!!

Even should this revelation have no effect in bringing on the day of universal emancipation, it is well for us to know it. It is well for us to see what slavery is, and to what it leads—it is well to discover the bottomless quagmire into which we might one day have fallen. Slave masters are showing themselves up to the universe, as the shameless and avowed plunderers of human rights. This is well. Thousands will be horror-struck, and stand off from the gulph into which they might otherwise have plunged.

Among the late exhibitions of the infatuated spirit of American slavery, none is more undisguised than the speech of "EDMUND BELINGER, JR., at a public meeting in Barnwell District, South Carolina." We think no man, with a spark of conscience left, can read it, without vowing to God eternal warfare with American slavery. Did the state of our

columns admit, we would publish it undivided. It will make abolitionists wherever it goes; indeed, the author seems to have suspected as much, for he assures his friends that he designs it to circulate only among those who are "southern in sentiment." We shall commence copying it with few and short comments:—

A SPEECH,

On the subject of Slavery, delivered 7th September, 1835, at a public meeting of the citizens of Barnwell District, South Carolina. By EDMUND BELINGER, JR.

"Enforced by Necessity—Sanctioned by Religion—and Justified by Law."

Published by request.

To the inhabitants of Barnwell District:—

FELLOW-CITIZENS.—The following speech, (written off and published at the request of my friends,) is very respectfully dedicated to you, before whom it was (in substance) delivered. Although published, I have used proper precautions to prevent its being circulated among any but those who are southern in sentiment, and southern in conduct—*to none other is it addressed.* I beg you to be assured, that in presenting to you my remarks, I am influenced not by feelings of vanity, but by an earnest wish to benefit if I can, the citizens of a district, from whom in times of political excitement, and at all times, I have experienced in my professional pursuits, the most kind regard and the most cheering encouragement. I beg you to be further assured, that however we may have differed as to other matters, on this subject there is, and, I trust, can be between us no difference of feeling or principle. Whatever may be the course of future events, in the cause of southern institutions you will find me with you, "shoulder to shoulder," sharing a common interest, and ready to encounter a common danger.

I remain, respectfully, &c.,

EDMUND BELINGER, JR.
Barnwell Court House, Sept., 1835.

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTIONS.

The following preamble and resolutions, unanimously adopted at the public meeting alluded to, were drawn up by E. Belinger, Jr., and approved of by the committee of twenty-one:—

The committee of twenty-one, to whom this meeting has referred the subject of incendiary publications, respectfully present the following report:—

Your committee deem it alike unnecessary, undignified and improper, to enter into discussions in defense of our rights and interests, as connected with the domestic policy and peculiar institutions (1) of the south. It is enough and more than enough, that neither that domestic policy, nor those peculiar institutions violate any rule of morality—any principle of justice, or any precept of Christianity. (!)

It is enough and more than enough, that those rights and interests were guaranteed and secured in the most express, and solemn, and binding form, by the constitution of our common country.

It is enough and more than enough, that the attitude which we maintain, has been forced upon us, not only by every principle of self-preservation, but by a stern, fixed, and unalterable necessity.

It is enough and more than enough, that we understand our rights—that *if strong hands and high hearts, and a just cause can avail, those rights shall be preserved.*

While, however, your committee decline entering into argument on the present occasion, they would suggest the propriety of our adopting such measures as will ensure the preservation of property and good order.

And after the most earnest and anxious consideration of the subject committed to their care, they present for your approval the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That any attempt to interfere with our domestic policy, whether by the Federal Government, or by the constituted authorities of the people of other States, would be and is, alike unconstitutional, unjust and iniquitous, and we proclaim our stern and fixed determination promptly to repel such interference at any and every hazard.

2. Resolved, That we view with abhorrence and detestation, the attempt to deluge our State with incendiary publications; and that we consider the authors of such attempts no more entitled to the protection of the laws, than the *ferocious monster or venomous reptile.*

3. Resolved, That the detestable conduct of such miscreants as Arthur Tappan and his villainous crew, cannot be countenanced or tolerated without incurring guilt second only to their own; and we trust that the constituted authorities of those States, in which they carry on their nefarious and diabolical proceedings, will see to it, that justice, humanity and religion, are no longer outraged.

Earnestly and solemnly do we invoke the intelligent, just and patriotic citizens of those States, by the force of public opinion and legal penalties, to crush those vile and infamous wretches, whose schemes of rapine and massacre, will, if unchecked, inevitably end in the destruction of American liberty.

4. Be it further Resolved, That if those States do not adopt prompt and effectual measures for preventing their citizens from printing and publishing books and papers, and from holding meetings and delivering addresses, calculated to disturb the peace and subvert the institutions of their sister States, then it will be the duty of the south, without delay, to refer the cause of southern rights to the united wisdom and united power of the southern States.

5. Resolved, That the bringing or circulating within these States of any written or printed papers; and also the holding of any conversation with an intent to disturb the peace of the same, in relation to our colored population, ought to be declared felony, and punished by death, without benefit of clergy.

6. Resolved, That it is the duty of Congress, so soon as practicable, to adopt suitable measures for preventing the United States mail from being converted to the purposes of incendiaries and assassins.

7. Resolved, That it is the imperative and indispensable duty of each and every post-master in the district, to exercise the utmost vigilance and promptness in seizing upon the incendiary publications sent to his office, and in delivering them up to the proper authorities to be burnt by the common Hangman.

8. Resolved, That the proper authorities should bear continually in mind the absolute necessity of

enforcing (promptly and rigidly,) all laws in relation to militia and patrol duty—in relation to unlawful assemblies, and other subjects well understood.

9. Resolved, That the chairman of this meeting do appoint a committee of thirteen individuals residing near the centre of the district, to whom shall be added as sub-committees, the militia officers residing in each company-beat. That the duty of these committees shall be, 1. To confer with the post-master within their respective limits. 2. To seize upon and have burnt all incendiary publications. 3. To see that the necessary and proper laws are duly enforced. 4. To keep an eye upon all suspicious characters. 5. To be vigilant, prompt and energetic, in bringing offenders to condign punishment. 6. And in general, to take care of the rights and interests of the district against incendiaries.

10. Resolved, That no man at the south can knowingly purchase from or trade with any abolitionists, or any merchant who deals with any abolitionist, without subjecting himself to the charge of being inimical to southern rights and southern interests.

11. Resolved, That the Chairman of this meeting be instructed in the name and in behalf of the citizens of the district, to offer a reward of \$1,000 for the detection and delivery to the committee of thirteen, or to the sheriff of the district, of any individual guilty of interfering with our peculiar rights.

12. Resolved, That all ministers of the gospel with their churches, be earnestly requested to co-operate with us in our designs; and in particular to allow no improper privileges.

13. Resolved, That while all unnecessary excitement should be avoided, it is the duty of each individual to exercise his utmost vigilance and caution, and to be, at all times, thoroughly prepared for the worst.

14. Resolved, Where the laws of the land are insufficient to meet the emergency, the laws of natural justice and self-preservation shall supply the deficiency—we are deliberately and advisedly determined that the guilty shall not escape.

15. Resolved, That we fully and cordially concur with our fellow-citizens of Charleston, in the resolutions adopted at their meeting of the 10th ult., and that like them "we are united as one man in the fixed and unalterable determination to maintain our rights and defend our property against all attacks"—"be the consequences what they may."

16. Resolved, That collectively and individually we do solemnly pledge ourselves to support our common rights and common interests, whether against Fanatics abroad, or Traitors at home.

The following resolutions were also offered by S. W. Trotti, Esq., and unanimously adopted:—

Resolved, That the thanks of this meeting and of the south are due to the independent and patriotic citizens of Philadelphia, who alone among the slaveholders, have truly met this crisis, by recommending the suppression of incendiary movements within their own borders by legislative action, the only certain method of insuring safety to the south without a dissolution of the Union.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Aiken Telegraph and Charleston papers.

In pursuance of the 9th resolution, the chair appointed Joseph Howell, Jesse Rice, Joseph G. W. Duncan, A. B. O'Bannon, Jas. E. Robinson, Wm. J. Harley, Joseph D. Allen, Lewis O'Bannon, Barnett H. Brown, Michael D. Maher, Ferdinand Burton, James Patterson, and Edmund Belinger, as the Central Vigilant Committee of the district.

GEORGE W. COLLINS, Chairman.
WILSON SANDERS, Secretary.

SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of this meeting:—We are all citizens of South Carolina! We are born and we live, not for ourselves alone, but for our country! And when that country is endangered, it is the duty—the imperative duty of each individual, however humble and obscure, to come forward in defense of her rights and interests, openly without reserve, and promptly without delay!

If this were a common occasion—if we were met to deal in abstract discussion, resulting in no practical good—if this day's proceedings were intended to make a display in the newspapers, and then be forgotten, it would be unnecessary and indecorous for one like myself, standing in no public relation, to occupy your time and attention.

But we are met on a solemn—I had almost said, an awful occasion. We assemble to consider the subject of the incendiary publications, and to provide measures for preventing our State from being inundated with the papers of reckless fanatics. But, intimately connected with the object of the meeting, is the consideration of the subject of slavery, as existing at the south. And when we reflect on the delicacy and danger of an improper discussion of the subject—when we bear in mind that the domestic policy and peculiar institutions of the south, have been subject to the grossest misunderstanding, and the vilest misrepresentation—that even some among us (2) have adopted erroneous views—that every mail from the north brings information of open hostility or inefficient friendship—that but as yesterday, an infuriated people in another section, have taken ample and bloody vengeance on the projectors of a hellish conspiracy—that of the members of that conspiracy, no less than 35 were within the borders of our State, and perhaps some of them (though God forbid!) within the borders of our district—when we look to the attitude of the north and the south in relation to this subject, and see the course of daily events, we cannot be blind to the fact, that we are entering on a conflict most tremendous, and that we are now to consider matters involving the rights and liberties of our State, and the destiny of our common country!

Never have we assembled under circumstances so momentous!

Never has there been such need of calm, collected wisdom and unshrinking firmness. (3)

While, however, such are the important and portentous considerations connected with this meeting, it is to me (and I believe to us all,) a source of high and unmingled gratification, that we assemble for no party purposes, and with no partisan feelings. The time has been when the lines of party divisions were distinctly and fearfully drawn—when there was mingled in our political contests, bitterness, and even hostility. But that time is rapidly passing away—if it has not already passed away!

To the patriotic and magnanimous expressions of the gentleman who has preceded me, I freely, and fully, and promptly respond! Here we meet on common ground! We this day give assurance to each

other, and declare to the world, that when we compromise no principle hitherto sustained, we mutually forgive and forget whatever unfriendly feeling there may have been in the past—that while we are divided by an honest difference of opinion, on doubtful and abstract points, and on views of expediency, as to the interests, the rights, and the honor of Carolina, our hearts are yet true to the core—that they beat,

"Pulse to pulse responsive still."

We are here to-day, as inhabitants of the same district, as members of one household, ready to rescue our rights from jeopardy!

What are those rights, and how are they jeopardized?

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that these are matters which will not admit of free and open debate. (4) I am also aware that with our enemies, to use the language of the report which was just read, "it would be alike unnecessary, undignified, and improper, to enter into any discussion in defense of our rights and interests as connected with the domestic policy and peculiar institutions of the south."

In particular, the miscreant Murrell, and the fanatic Tappan, deserve, and will receive at our hands, no reply but the *cuchida, or hemp, the lash or the halter!* But at a meeting like this, where we are consulting for the good of the republic, where my remarks are to be considered confidential, and intended to go no further than those who hear me, (or our friends,) there can be no danger, and may be great advantage, in examining the foundation of our rights, and the truth of those loathsome charges, which unholy fanaticism and detestable avarice have combined to heap upon our heads.

Among those charges, some of the few which time is afforded to notice, are, that this system of slavery as existing in South Carolina, and in the southern States generally, is condemned alike by justice, humanity, and religion,—that we are a disgrace to humanity—that we have forfeited all title to be called men of honor, or to take a place in the same grade of society as the people of England—that we are felons of the human race—the basest and vilest of mankind—traitors to liberty, to our honor, and blasphemers of the Almighty.

This language has been stated in order to show the nature of the charges, and the spirit and feelings with which they are advanced. They have been echoed and re-echoed across the Atlantic, from the fanatics of the North to the fanatics of Europe, until our accusers seem, in their sympathy for one part of our population, to have lost all feeling for the other—until one would imagine that these disinterested friends of humanity—these meek and pious Christians—these self-constituted (aye, self-prostituted) reformers of southern degeneracy—consider cutting our throats and burning our dwellings, as appropriate and indispensable parts in their labor of love! (5)

Let us turn from this disgusting picture to a serious and solemn examination of the fact—let us satisfy our own consciences and our honor. There are some even among us who consider slavery an evil, though a necessary evil—as a wrong, though an unavoidable wrong. And in this they are properly commended by the advocates of abolition to have the strong ground of our defense. I make no such erroneous and mortifying admissions. Let us suppose that the State of South Carolina were arraigned before the tribunal of the world, or the tribunal of posterity, to answer for the crime and the evils of slavery.—Mark her justification!

I waive the argument, that the non-slaveholding States have equally participated in the guilt of the origin of slavery, to use no harsher terms. (6) I waive the argument, that the English nation are chargeable with having forced the system upon her American colonies; and that in the Declaration of Independence, as originally drawn by Mr. Jefferson, it was stated (among the grievances which had produced the revolution) that the King of England steadily resisted all efforts of the colonies to prevent the introduction of slaves.

I waive the argument, that the non-slaveholding States, while shunning slavery as an evil, and reprobating it as a crime, have participated, and do still continue to participate largely (though indirectly) in the profits of slavery. (7)

Behold (as a practical commentary) the great abolitionist of the north attacking the peace of the south, and endeavoring to corrupt the minds of our slaves with means furnished by a trade with the south. (8)

I waive the argument, that the condition of our slaves is comfortable and happy—beyond comparison more so than that of the lower classes in those countries where Slavery, does not exist by law. (9)

I waive the argument, that our laws for the regulation of slavery, and the protection of slaves, are wise and humane. (10)

I waive the argument, that the masters of our slaves in the south, (and especially in Carolina,) from a sense of justice and humanity, (though self-interest alone would ensure such a result,) discharge with fidelity and strictness their duties towards those who are dependent on them for food, clothing, and protection; and that those masters do more for their comfort and happiness, both temporal and eternal, than ever has been effected, by the preaching of fanaticism, and the practice of folly.

I waive the argument, founded on the example of Greece, of Rome, of the English colonies, and of the United States, confirming the lessons of history, in all countries, and at all times, that the people are most free, prosperous, and happy, under those governments which recognize slavery.

I waive the argument, founded on the instances of St. Domingo and the West India islands, which furnish startling commentaries on the direful consequences of slavery.

NOTES.

(4) So are we. We appreciate the good sense of confining all argument in defense of slavery among its friends. Will not our doctors of divinity and learned professors begin to be ashamed of repeating apologies for slavery, which slaveholders themselves think best to keep at home?

But why are arguments needed among the friends of slavery? Is the "foundation" of their "rights"—to do wrong—beginning to give way? Do they find it necessary "to swear truth to England," to keep up their own belief?

(5) When good men are reviled, they revile not again. (6) If slavery is not an evil, how could there be any "guilt" in its origin? Truly, the speaker has good reason to "waive the argument."

(7) The fact is, that the non-slaveholding States do not "reprobate slavery as a crime," and that is the reason why abolitionists preach and print at the north.

(8) What better proof of sincerity than to act against his own "trade"? If the slaves themselves should be consulted, could they be better pleased than that their earnings should go to free off their chains?

(9) There are many who do not waive this argument, and yet they know it to be false. Were it true, persons who have experienced both conditions would be running into slavery instead of out of it.

(10) See Stroud's sketch of them—for sale at the Anti-Slavery office, 141, Nassau street.

quences of abolition. Aye, commentaries written in characters of fire, and dashed with blood!

I waive the argument that there is no State in the Union where the badge of slavery is not recognized; for there is no State in the Union where the colored population are admitted to a full participation of the rights and privileges of the citizen. They are, in all States, a degraded and inferior class,—the same causes which keep them in a state of crowded slavery at the south, keep them at the north in a state of slavery under the disguise of freedom! (11)

I waive the argument, founded on the political advantages of slavery in ameliorating the condition of the female sex (12)—in acting as a barrier for the safety and comfort of the lower orders (13)—in protecting the peace and quiet of the country against the turbulence of mobs (14)—in preserving pure the elective franchise—in enabling the spirit, and perpetuating the institutions of liberty.

I waive the argument that in all countries slavery will and must exist. If not recognized and regulated by law, it will be seen in fact. If there are no black slaves, a substitute will be found in the lower class of citizens; nor will I pause to institute a comparison between the negro of the south on the one hand, and the French peasant, or the English or northern servant, or the German boor, or the Russian serf on the other.

I waive the argument that the system of negro slavery has been in operation for the last three hundred years, and that the experiment has been fully and successfully tried.

I waive the argument, that this is our property, like other property, bequeathed to us by our parents, or earned by the sweat of OUR brow—by the hard efforts of honest industry!! (15)

I waive the argument that no authority on earth has the right, nor, if we are true to ourselves, the power, to strip us of that property, or to crush the hope that we will be enabled to leave some small pittance to our children, who in a few years will take our places, when time and affliction shall have laid upon us their heavy hands, and checked and destroyed the vigor and alacrity of our brighter and better days.

Let all this go for nothing; brush it away as so much trash. I take stronger and higher grounds. What has been, and is our position, in relation to this subject? We are not chargeable with the guilt of the origin of slavery—the system was forced upon us—it has become intimately connected with the interests and happiness of our people—it forms a part, and an exceedingly important part, of our social and political existence, we say that the system shall be continued.—THE RELATIONS OF MASTER AND SLAVE SHALL NOT BE CHANGED.—WE WILL RESIST, AND RESIST TO THE MOST BITTER EXTREMITY, ALL ATTEMPTS AT ABOLITION, WHETHER PRESENT OR FUTURE, GENERAL OR PARTIAL, IMMEDIATE OR REMOTE!!! (16)—On this subject we have advisedly made up our minds. To use the language of one of the Resolutions reported, "We proclaim our stern and fixed determination promptly to repel, at any and every hazard, any attempts to interfere with our domestic policy;" and I may add, we also proclaim our stern and fixed determination that this domestic policy shall, as far as in us lies, be PERPETUAL!!! (17)

Such fellow-citizens, has been our position, and such will be, in future, our course of conduct. And I maintain that this position, and this course, is enforced by necessity, sanctioned by religion, and justified by law! Mark my words, and watch my argument narrowly.—If I do not make it appear beyond contradiction or doubt, that this position, and this course, is enforced by necessity, sanctioned by religion, and justified by law, then I shall fall in my effort.

Enforced by necessity.

If our course has been wrong—if slavery is an evil and a crime, there must be a change: what shall be done? Emancipation in itself is an easy task. It is easy to pull down and destroy—it is easy to ignite a mass of gunpowder! Let an insane legislature, supported by an insane people remove all prohibitions and obstacles to the contrary—let proclamations be made that the relation of master and slave has ceased to exist, and the work is done! But what next?

Those admitted to freedom must be either sent away, or permitted to remain. They cannot be sent away.

1st. Because it would be utter ruin to our staple commodity, white labor being totally incompetent to supply that of negroes. (18)

2d. Because the value of our lands would be reduced to nothing.

3d. Because, to take out of our State, property to the amount of the value of our slaves, at a moderate average, would give a fatal stab to the prosperity of our State.

4th. Because it is presumed, that in any scheme of emancipation, the right of property is to be respected; whence would the compensation come? What treasury on earth could compensate the planters of the south for slave labor? This court house screw-packed with bank bills, could not supply the loss which the farmers of this district would suffer from such a change.

Concluded on the last page.

NOTES.

(11) True. Hence the reason why abolitionists do not "go to the south." Justice must first be done at the north; and abolitionists are determined to take nothing for justice but the entire prostration of the "badge of slavery." They plead that a man shall not be deprived of his rights for the hue that God has given him.

(12) By reducing more than a million of females to the condition of brutes, and subjecting them to the brutal lusts of every white man! all this,—that certain other females may be saved from soiling their lily white hands!

(13) By making labour dishonorable, and forever preventing the poor from rising by it.

(14) Have the mobs been against slavery, or for it? (15) The same applies to all robbers. They can earn the property which they plunder, by the "sweat of their brow"—by the hard efforts of honest industry." What great pains a robber sometimes takes to break into a store, and after all, he gets very little. What a pity that even that should be taken from him!

(16) And so after having waived all the arguments, the speaker concludes that slavery is right, because it shall be continued! We are reminded of the sermon of a slave preacher, who in discoursing upon the history of Jonah, thus represented the disposition of the prophet when the Lord called him to account for his anger at the loss of his gourd. "The Lord said to Jonah, 'Jonah, what for you so mad?' Then Jonah, he tiff as bull dog, he say, 'CAUSE I WILL!'"

(17) Here is the spirit of slavery—just such as we always supposed. Here is the roaring of the wild "bells of Bashaan." Soft language! Why, they will thank us for that, no doubt, and very peaceably continue to trample on two and a half millions of men, women, and children. They do not like to be goaded. Never will such ferocity relent, and give up the prey, till forced by the intolerable power of just rebuke.

(18) True. Therefore keep the laborers, and give them fair wages.

Northern Spirit.

MR. KING'S SPEECH IN THE SENATE OF OHIO.

If there was no other merit in the speech of a legislator, now-a-days, than a declaration of his paramount regard for "justice and moral duty," it would call for publication throughout the land. The following speech of Mr. King of the State Senate, was published, not only because of the prominence it gives to this criterion of action, whether public or private, but because it is acceptable for its style, and for its manly and dignified moderation.

It would seem that to any one who can persuade himself to put away passion and prejudice, in considering the relations of the colored people to the whites; to any one who can approach the subject with the deliberation of the patriot-statesman, that he may reach the wisest conclusions for the general good—to such an one, we say, the course to be pursued is plain and easy. We will suggest a few points that seem to us worthy of consideration.

1. If it were intended in a short time to extirpate by putting to death, or to banish the colored people among us, there would not be a loud call for any plan to mollify their condition. It would scarcely be worth the pains and trouble of bringing it into operation. But this cannot be done—our constitution, our laws, our humanity, meagre as it seems to be in regard to this class of our population, all forbid either of these courses. The presumption, nay, the certainty, then is, that they and their multiplying descendants will remain among us. Calmly considering this as a settled point, what ought to be the aim of the enlarged and comprehensive and statesman-like mind in reference to them? Certainly, to make them as useful and valuable in the community, and therefore as happy in themselves—as laws founded on justice and benevolence can make them.

He shows that his powers of observation have been employed to but little purpose, who recommends for the attainment of these objects, a system of brutal oppression and cruelty, under the sanction of legislative enactment. Has this scheme ever been successful in making any class of people who have been its victims, more orderly, more virtuous, or more useful to themselves or the community at large? All history confirms the assertion that it has not. If there were as many tigers in the state, which the law said should not be killed, it would be the part of wisdom not to goad, and tease, and torment them. They ought rather, by mild usage, and gentle treatment, to be made as harmless as their nature would admit.

2. It is at least worthy of a trial, to treat the colored people with more kindness, than they have as yet experienced from us. Their present condition as a class, if it be as represented, is not owing to their many privileges—but to the *fewness* of them. If those who have the power, were to deprive a similar number of the most ignorant and most neglected whites among us, of the rights they now enjoy, so as to put them on the same footing with the colored people—especially if such oppression were to be perpetuated on their offspring—they would, doubtless, soon furnish as many and as just grounds of complaint on account of depravity in its various phases, as the class about which we are now speaking. Why is a free government so desirable? Not, solely, *altogether*, because it enables men to make more money, and to enjoy the pleasures money buys, with more security than under a tyrannical one. No; but because it summons into unrestrained action, all man's powers—physical, intellectual, moral—suffering them to gambol in their native playfulness, in their first strength; to stretch forward to honorable emulation and usefulness in the maturity of their vigor; and to go on and on, seeking that happiness which God has adapted to every department of his nature, and offers to his acceptance. Free governments make men *happier*, because their tendency is, to make them *better*.

3. As long as *SLAVERY* exists in the south, so long will there be an increase of this portion of our population. The few that are emancipated having no employment there, (for slaveholders will not as a general thing, employ freemen to labor with their slaves,) will of course seek it in the free States. In the present state of things, they cannot be kept out of the free States—for as bad as is their condition here, it is not so bad as it is now, or likely to be hereafter, in the slave States.

The sympathy beginning to be felt by the people of the free States, for the persecuted and unoffending offspring of those whose ancestors were the slaves of ours, is rapidly growing, and the next generation will blush, when they come to repeal the enactments of the present. Emancipation, at the colored race in this country can be separated from the white. Let this take place, and the present slaves become at once, the laboring class in the south; reaping the reward of their labor, under the protection of just laws; forming a large proportion, if not a majority, of the population; having their own schools and churches, which their numbers would then enable them to support; in fine, "sitting under their own vine and fig tree, and none to make them afraid" of being flogged, or sold from their wives and their husbands, their children and their parents, they would have before them all those motives, which have heretofore been so successful in refining and civilizing the race of man. This state of things in the south, where labor is more wanting than in the north, where the climate is more adapted to the colored man's constitution, and where there would be every inducement, so far as we can see, to operate on the colored population of the free States, would drain them off from the latter and settle them in the south.

Mr. KING spoke as follows:—

Mr. SPEAKER:—I am fully sensible of the great and increasing interest and excitement which is manifested, and the diversity of opinions which are entertained, upon many questions which might fairly arise in a discussion of the subject embraced in the proposition under consideration.

That it is one of extreme delicacy, involving important principles of constitutional rights and moral duties, which will require the utmost wisdom and prudence to settle and adjust satisfactorily to the people of the State,—the numerous petitions which have been presented to this body, from time to time, and year after year, numerous signed by all classes of society, in all sections of the State, asking for a repeal or modification of the existing laws upon this subject, sufficiently evince. That more rigorous measures, in relation to this unfortunate class of our population, are desired by any considerable portion of the people of the State, I have yet to learn.

The subject, however, when fairly presented to us for our action as legislators, is one that we cannot shrink from investigating, however unpleasant and undesirable it may be, and should bestow upon it that calm, dispassionate, and careful attention, which its importance requires.

Having no desire to bring into this discussion any unnecessary excitement, I shall endeavor to avoid whatever may have such a tendency, in stating, as briefly as possible, some of the reasons which impel me to oppose the passage of this resolution.

In coming to a conclusion upon the proposition presented, two questions very naturally present themselves for our consideration. The first is, can the measure proposed be sustained upon the broad principles of equity and justice? The second is one of policy and expediency. If, on an enlightened and comprehensive view of the whole subject, we shall be constrained to answer in the negative the question first suggested, then, I trust, all further examination will be needless.

It is not, I humbly conceive, to be considered inappropriate on this occasion, to take a hasty glance at the situation and condition of this unfortunate race, whose interests and social relations are to be affected by this measure. By what means, and through whose agency, have our

relations been formed with these people, whom we now seek to cast out beyond the protection of our laws? Is it in consequence of any voluntary act on their part, that they are now found in our midst, scattered throughout our land? or have they by any transgression of our laws forfeited the right of protection, which all rightful governments are bound to extend to every member of the community?

To answer these questions satisfactorily to myself, I need not advert to the origin, nor trace the progress of that inhuman system which first brought them to our shores. Suffice it to say, on this occasion, that their introduction amongst us was an act of force and oppression on our part, authorized by our laws,—the pernicious consequences and withering effects of which were early foreseen, and boldly denounced, by some of the most eminent statesmen and illustrious patriots of America, while under the colonial government of Great Britain.

The inhumanity and injustice, as well as the impolicy and danger of the measure, were the subjects of repeated petitions and remonstrances to the British throne, by many of the colonial governments, at that early period of our history. Their complaints and remonstrances, however, were unavailing—they were compelled to submit to the strong arm of power,—and we are now reaping the bitter fruits of that policy, the baneful effects of which are already perceptible in all our social and civil institutions, and would to God we were sure they would not yet convulse this nation to its center, and spread desolation and death throughout this sensitive, thinking, and divided republic.

And most heartily could I rejoice, did the faithful pages of history disclose that our connection with, and approbation of this unrighteous system, as a nation, terminated with our allegiance to the British crown—that the odium and the responsibility of the measure might have rested upon that government alone which advised it. Then, indeed, might we, with more seeming plausibility, now seek to absolve ourselves from the moral obligations which are now entailed upon us, as a nation, to sustain and protect them.

Unfortunately for our reputation and character, for our peace and quietude, this consoling reflection is denied us. Already has the pen of the historian recorded, that for more than a quarter of a century after we had assumed an independent rank amongst the nations of the earth; after we had promulgated to the world the liberal principles upon which our government was to be founded and administered; after proclaiming, as a part of our political creed, "that all men were born free and equal—that they were endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that the just powers of a government were derived only from the consent of the governed—that whenever a government became destructive of the ends of justice, it was the right and duty of the people to alter or abolish it."—this barbarous system of stealing from their homes in a distant land this portion of the human family, transporting them to our country, and selling them in our markets—a practice which has since been stamped with infamy by the whole civilized world, and punished with death—was diligently pursued by our citizens, encouraged by our laws, and guaranteed by the Constitution of our country.

It has thus been under the most solemn sanctions of the government of our own choice, that our land has been filled with this class of our population, by which we have incurred the sacred moral obligations of providing for their safety and protection. And can we now, under these circumstances, with any regard to justice, as separate sovereignties, State by State absolve ourselves from these moral obligations, and, under the plea that they are becoming burdensome to the State, cast them as outlaws from the community.

As well might we attempt, in the present enlightened age, to justify that barbarous practice of ancient times amongst the Romans, of destroying that portion of the population which, through natural or physical defects, they were apprehensive would become chargeable to the State; or the still more ancient one adopted by the Egyptian monarch, of slaying the first-born of the Israelites, to lessen the danger apprehended from their becoming too numerous for the safety and welfare of his own people and the stability of his government. The reasons and the motives assigned in the former, can alone be urged in the present case. It was then claimed to be a measure of public policy, required for the security and well-being of that portion of the community who held the power and controlled the destinies of the nation; and if the manner of attaining the same object strikes us with greater abhorrence, their rightful claim to exact implicit obedience to all measures of State policy from that portion of the people upon whom this power was to be exercised, must also strike us with greater force.

They had voluntarily emigrated to that country—submitted themselves to its government and laws—and were indebted to them for the preservation of their lives. In that instance, as is the present, however, it was an arbitrary act, founded in power, and not in right and justice.

But it is asked, what shall be done with this class of our population? and if any are desirous that this degraded race should remain amongst us?

To the first enquiry I would reply, that I would yet do them that justice which is still in our power. Instead of still further restricting and degrading them, I would, until some other liberal and just measure was adopted for their future welfare and disposition, extend to them those rights and privileges which, as a nation, we have declared the whole family of man are justly entitled to, and which the Constitution of our country secures to all its citizens,—of acquiring property, obtaining employment, and following the pursuits of industry with the same facilities as others, without requiring them to procure bonds that they will not, through misfortune or any other cause, become chargeable to the State. I would secure to them, in some way, a just and fair participation in the advantages of our public schools, which the Constitution of our State declares "shall be open for the reception of scholars and students of every grade, without any distinction of preference whatsoever."

I would preserve the ancient personified emblem of Justice, so often seen crowning her temples, from the degradation and pollution of removing the bandage from her eyes to discover the complexion of the humble petitioner in her court, and of laying aside her even balances to dispense colored justice. I would permit our courts of justice to be open alike to all citizens not polluted by crime, and leave to the discriminating intelligence of our judges and jurors to determine from the character and credibility of witnesses, the proper weight of their testimony.

In answer to the second enquiry, whether it is desirable that this degraded race should remain and increase amongst us? I believe every true American patriot at the present day would most heartily respond that his wishes would be otherwise, and that he now deeply deplores that policy which first introduced them into our country.

This ardent desire, however, to be freed from them, does not establish the right of driving them from us by odious and oppressive laws, nor of depriving them of their natural and inherent rights while they remain, nor does it cast the responsibility of retaining them upon those who now seek to secure to them these rights, and elevate them from that state of degradation and oppression to which they have been so long subjected. Our acts of legislation must be applied to men and things as they are, and not as we might wish them to be.

These people are already here—under the circumstances which have been stated, and we can legislate upon their claims in no other manner than if they were rightfully here. This has become the land of their birth, their country and their home, not by their own choice, but through our agency, and the policy pursued by our government; nor can we,

without doing violence to all the principles of justice and moral duty, and to the maxims and spirit of our laws, avoid the consequences and responsibilities of our own wrongful acts, by assuming the position that they have now become measures of self-defence. Such a plea could not be sustained in the administration of justice under our criminal code, even where the life of a fellow-being was involved—much less, then, should it be adopted, when the object sought to be attained was to confer benefits on one class of the community at the expense of another.

It is a course of reasoning which has so often been resorted to by those in power, to secure prerogatives and privileges to themselves, but which, if applied to them as the *minor* class, they would spurn from them with horror.

It would then, most clearly, become a tyrant's plea for an act of injustice and oppression. It has not, nor will it ever be urged by any who are not of that class to whom the benefits will result; nor will it ever be cordially acquiesced in by those whom it is intended to depress.

It has often been asserted they are an inferior, degraded, and indolent race, and that no moral or intellectual culture can ever elevate them to the same level of the whites. Whether this assertion, however strongly supported by facts drawn from their present condition, is sufficient to overthrow the only authentic history of the origin of man, that God formed of one blood all the nations of the earth, I will leave for each to determine for himself.

Before coming to a conclusion upon that point, however, I would recommend that they extend their researches beyond those influences and circumstances, which at present surround and control them in this country. I would ask them to ascertain from the history of man, the effects which the same influences and circumstances have had upon other nations and people in other times, and learn the truth of that statement handed down to us from the celebrated poet of Greece, in relation to another people,

"That whatever day
Makes man a slave, takes half his worth away."

The measures which have been pursued in relation to this class of our population, are directly calculated to extinguish in them all sense of moral justice and obligation, and to keep them in that state of ignorance and degradation which they now occupy. They have no motives to stimulate them to industry, or to acquire knowledge, if it was in their power. And while they behold all their natural, personal, and social rights trampled upon—their circumstances denied them of enjoyment arbitrarily taken from them, and all that man holds dear, or that can render life desirable, and even life itself insecure and unprotected,—the irresistible impulse of our nature is to disregard all laws made for the protection of those rights in others. It arises from the same conviction of right, that we take the life of one, who would take our own.

In reviewing the history of former times, however, it will be found that the sons of Africa have not always held a secondary rank in the scale of nations; nor are we without evidence at the present day, that they are still capable of self-government, of sustaining themselves as a people, of securing and establishing their rights, and of maintaining them against fearful odds, by their own laws. Indeed, if it were otherwise, it would only show, in a still stronger light, the duty of extending to them the same benevolent protection, which we do to other classes of society who are incapable of protecting themselves.

In after times, while the magnificent establishments which are now erecting throughout the land at the public expense, for the sustenance, comfort, and the restoration of the sick and infirm—for the education and instruction of the dumb and the blind—for the amelioration of the condition, and the preservation of the lunatic and the insane, and for the reformation of the transgressors of our laws, will remain as lasting monuments of the benevolence and philanthropy of our State towards those unfortunate classes of society; and while the policy which has been pursued in relation to the remaining tribes of the Aborigines of this country, in securing to them a portion of the public domain, and providing for their removal and sustenance, will show to our descendants that, as a nation, we were not wholly regardless of the forms and principles of moral justice in our dealings with them, our acts of cruelty and oppression towards this unfortunate race, will be transcribed upon records more durable than marble, as lasting as time, as mementoes of our inconsistency and avarice, and of the injustice and inhumanity which has been extended to them.

For myself, sir, so long as I hold a seat upon this floor, whenever the alternative is presented to choose between an act of justice, and of State policy requiring a sacrifice of justice, I will ever pursue the course adopted by the celebrated Athenian demagogue the Just, who, on being selected by the council of his State to hear the disclosures of one of his colleagues in the government, who had conceived a project which he represented would be of the utmost utility and benefit to their own State among the confederate States of Greece, after hearing the disclosure, at once openly declared to the people, that although nothing could be of greater advantage to his native city than the project of his colleague, yet at the same time nothing could be more unjust.

This simple statement alone, was sufficient with that high-minded people to induce them to decide, that whatever might be the project or how great soever the advantages might be to their State, it should be at once and forever abandoned.

It was the influence of such principles that elevated those ancient Republics of Greece, in the scale of moral excellence and power, so far above the nations which surrounded them; and it was a departure from these principles both in Greece and Rome, in creating different castes and grades in society, which laid the foundation for those intestine commotions and dissensions, and those partizan contests for power between the Patricians and the Plebeians, which deluged their land in blood, and finally subverted their popular governments, and destroyed their liberties.

I will give my hearty and cordial co-operation to any measure required by the interests of the State, in relation to this people, at almost any sacrifice, except the sacrifice of justice and moral duty; but I cannot yield my assent to a measure which I do not believe is called for by the people, and which I deem a violation of both, and of the Constitution of the Nation, and of this State.

Congressional.

Extracts from the Washington Correspondence of the Cincinnati Gazette.

Our latest dates from Washington, are Jan. 5th, giving the proceedings in Congress, of Monday, Jan. 4th. It is humiliating to observe the transactions of the House of Representatives. Nothing has yet been done, of any import, except to battle, in various forms, the abolition and anti-slavery question. The southern members are pursuing a course very much to be regretted. They go for strangling all enquiry; for choking off petitions, remonstrances, recommendations; every thing not in accordance with their own views. It was the south that caused the following provision to be inserted in the Constitution of the United States, by way of amendment:—

"Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Our latest intelligence, Monday, January 4th, brought back the abolition question, in all its virulence. There is every indication of great exasperation during the present session. There seems to be no one in the House, either qualified or disposed to act efficiently, in calming the troubled waters. In the Senate, there is less turmoil.

Freedom of the Press and of Speech.

THE ABOLITION QUESTION.

We continue to-day the debate in Congress on the "Abolition Question"—a form it has now certainly assumed, in consequence of the violence of certain southern members, (*Nullifiers*). In vain did the friends of the administration endeavor to refer it, *sub silentio*, to the committee on the District of Columbia. It must be met—it ought to be met—it shall be met, declared a member from the south—and where, when, or how it will end, it is impossible to say. That Congress will by a deliberate veto abridge even in the least degree, the clear and unquestionable right to petition, we do not believe. The representative of a free people assumes a fearful responsibility when he assents, either by word or deed, to the restriction of this right. We are not prepared for retrograde measures in any form—for who does not see that if this is conceded to nullification, it is only preliminary to other and higher demands. If a law is passed, declaring no petitions shall be received by Congress on a certain subject, it would be well to enquire, what the next demand may be.

Every reader must have heard of the famous "Syllable leaves." The Sybil disposed of them freely—when she rose exorbitantly in her demands for the remainder. We, too, may dispose freely of the leaves of the Constitution, (guaranteed rights) but will this satisfy the rapacity of the faction who are seeking, under the cover of *state rights*, to immolate that grand palladium of our liberties? No—with each succeeding compliance, they will rise in their demands, until every State, Territory, and District throughout the wide extent of the Union, shall be brought in servile subjection to their own domination. We do not wish to excite unnecessary alarm—but suppose we examine a little closer into the matter, and arrange the demands as they may, and no doubt would be made, in the order of their execution—that is, if the right of petitioning should be abridged:—

1. No memorial shall be received by Congress in reference to the District of Columbia.
2. No law shall be passed by Congress, having the remotest relation to the subject of slavery.
3. Slavery, as a domestic institution, shall be perpetuated henceforth and forever.
4. Congress shall pass a law rendering it penal for any post-master to transmit any newspaper, periodical, or letter, which contains any expression on the subject of slavery.

5. No man north of the Potomac, shall speak or write on the subject of slavery: if so, a formal decree shall be made on the Governor of the State in which he may have committed the offence, who shall forthwith deliver him up, in order that he may be taken south of the Potomac, and put to death according to southern laws.

6. No man or woman shall agitate the question in any manner whatever, or even pronounce "slavery an evil, and say it ought to be abolished;"—on doing so, no matter in what section of the Union the offence may be committed, he or she so offending, shall at once be taken before a magistrate, and committed, as guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor against the sovereignty and integrity of the several States of the Union.

These are a few of the beauties of "the restrictive system," when carried out practically. Penal measures having once been commenced,—who shall say when and where they ought to stop? This is a delicate point for our consideration. If Congress should pass a law on this subject, regulating the mails, what a singular scene must such a course inevitably superinduce. Each post-master in the Union must be made a censor. On him or his agents devolves the high office of opening and inspecting each paper or periodical, to ascertain its contents—(on the subject of opening letters, we shall say nothing; for they can scarcely suppose for a moment, we will be either so submissively tame, or so supremely stupid, as to yield this right along with others.) Well: the post-master finds an article under the head of Slavery, or any other caption—but the article is calmly written—contains statistical information, and among other views, an examination into the benefits of abolishing slavery in the West India islands—in a word, a view of the apprenticeship system, and a comparative statement of the gross amount of the products of the islands, before and after its adoption. The first question with the post-master will naturally be—Is, or is not the article incendiary? His determination may be either affirmative or negative. If the latter, it is re-enclosed, and forwarded. If the former, it is stopped—*but why?* Because the post-master, according to what may be the complexion of his mind, comes to the conclusion that it may produce discussion or enquiry at home—in other words, make men *think*—for facts are the materials of philosophy—and we must think before we can become philosophers. We will take an example. The publishers of the New York Evening Post have an unquestionable right to publish and circulate their paper: this will not be denied. They are *freemen*, protected by the laws, in "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and the profits of their vocation are the means whereby they live. As has been the case, so again the paper may contain temperately written articles on the slave question. It is sent to the N. York post-office, and examined. Mr. Post-master, or one of his clerks in his absence, detains the whole mail, and throws it into one corner, to be sold as waste paper,—one of the perquisites of the office. Subscribers in Philadelphia and elsewhere, complain that they do not receive their papers. The publishers institute an investigation. "Our subscribers do not receive their papers, and we are sure the fault rests with you." "Your paper, gentlemen," replies Mr. Governor, "I am sorry to say, contains incendiary matter, and the law, you are aware, makes it my duty to stop it."

"Well, sir, will you have the kindness to point out the incendiary article, or, as there are degrees in every thing, and must be degrees in this, can you tell us what degree of incendiary the article falls under?" "I was in some doubts of your paper of Thursday, from an article on the 'Wealth of Nations.' It contained this paragraph—'Slavery is an evil, and has been found in all ages of the world to exercise a direct tendency to demoralize and impoverish the community in which it exists.' I think, gentlemen, you will agree with me; this falls under the special act, and is incendiary in the third degree." "And you did not mail the paper?" "Certainly not—the law is imperative." "But the paragraph you have cited, and under which you condemn our paper, is a mere truism, reiterated for ages, and even in monarchical countries: why then, or how is it incendiary?" "Gentlemen, it is not for me to assign to you the reasons of the law. However, here is the act of Congress: read for yourselves."

"Be it enacted, &c., that any post-master, assistant post-master, or post-office agent, who shall knowingly mail, or cause to be mailed, any newspaper, periodical or sheet, containing articles on the subject of slavery of an incendiary character, whether in the first, second, or third degree, shall be guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor, and punished before a court of law, having competent jurisdiction, by imprisonment not exceeding one year, nor less than six months, with a fine of not more than one thousand dollars, nor less than five hundred according to the degree of the offence."

"The third degree defines the misdemeanor to be in circulating any paper calculated to produce any interference with the slave question. Now, in our candid judgment, the exceptionable paragraph contains no such thing."

"I beg leave to differ with you gentlemen, but you can appeal. Our courts have the power of determining whether papers do or do not fall under the several provisions of the act. You had better refer the matter."

"We shall certainly do so—matters have indeed come to a strange pass."

Well, to carry out the case, the matter is referred, and the court decides that the paper in question contained nothing to justify its suppression. A suit for damages is instituted against the post-office department, and he is by the verdict of the jury, mulcted in damages to the amount of \$500.

Who will say, if a law is passed interfering with the post-office department, that cases like the above would not be literally and practically produced.

We have stated it as an illustration of the beauties of the restrictive system, which the nullifiers are laboring to bring about and establish.—*Phil. Ev. Star.*

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

NEW RICHMOND, OHIO, JAN. 15, 1836.

EDITORS,—who exchange with us, will please send their papers hereafter to CINCINNATI.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—We have received a few communications—one very long, on a subject not sufficiently connected with our main one, to authorize its publication in our columns, at least, for the present. On the subject of Slavery, too, and its adjuncts and incidents, we wish to receive for publication, the results of sober thought as well as of mature mind. The subject is becoming too important for any one to write on it, merely to try *what he can do*. We shall be glad to receive from our abolition friends such original essays on any department of the subject, as ought in the present state of the question, to be sent forth for the information or instruction of our readers.

We wish to have communicated to us the progress of the abolition cause, generally in the west, but especially in this State.

We want the facts of slavery, stripped of all passionate or vituperative language, and well authenticated.

Mr. CLAY.—ABOLITION.—FREE DISCUSSION.—"A Stranger in Washington" professes to give substantially, this gentleman's remarks on the two subjects at the head of this article, at the late annual meeting of the Colonization Society in Washington. He does not pretend to give the "words" of Mr. Clay—but, rather, such as express the emotions excited in his own breast by the orator. "Abolition," said he, "was a curse—a fiend incarnate, which had entered our terrestrial paradise, to deceive and to destroy. Instead of breaking bonds, it had drawn them closer. Instead of being the messenger of peace, it was the demon of discord." Now, if Mr. Clay has descended to the use of language of which this is even the loosest paraphrase; if he has so far forgotten the respect which he should cherish for himself, for the station which he fills, and for a large and increasing and law-respecting class of his fellow-citizens, it is much to be deplored. Especially his friend, personal and political—and in both characters, since his name was associated with the first office in the government, we have been behind none in constancy and sincerity—have reason to lament his want of temper, at such a time. In the great moral contest for which this nation is now girding itself, in the struggle already commenced between the spirit of Liberty and the spirit of Slavery—between the principles of our republic and those of an institution at war—irreconcilable war—with them, no one, at all approaching him in distinction would have been looked to with such expectation, as Mr. Clay. His residence in a part of the country not yet entirely subdued by the slaveholder, and supposed to be, more than any other of the slaveholding States, favorable to emancipation; his generous devotion to this cause at the very outset of his political life—his manly advocacy of liberty in South America—in Greece—and in every nation throughout the world, where the chains of tyrants were either strained or broken by men determined to be free—all these things conspired, we say, in a peculiar manner to direct toward Mr. Clay, the eyes of many of the friends of liberty who burn to make their country his home.

But when he is seen, seizing, with eager speed, the earliest opportunity of giving vent to a bad temper (a defect in Mr. Clay, which, in all probability, has been at the bottom of his exclusion from the highest gift of his country) of descending, as a volunteer, to the low grounds already occupied by the McDuffies, the Swains, the Shyes, &c. *et id omne genus*,—that he might contend with them for the most strained epithets of abuse against men from whom individually, he cannot withhold his respect—all this, we say, must be cause of grief and mortification to his friends, who are, also, the friends of the country: not only, because it gives evidence of his never having deserved, or of his having justly forfeited, the esteem in which they have held him, but because it affords strong demonstration, that he is totally unqualified for the elevated station to which the times and circumstances of the country are now calling some statesman, who will, it is to be hoped, whilst he is equal to Mr. Clay in intellectual power, prove greatly his superior in that dignity of temper, which not only respects itself but controls itself.

Full well does Mr. Clay know, that, if the bonds of slavery are not broken, it has not been because the abolitionists have left unassayed the most powerful, yet peaceful means they could employ. If they have been drawn closer—that it is not the abolitionist who has done it. Why, then, such a vulgar taunt? Is Mr. Clay mad, because the abolitionist has tainted the slaveholder's atmosphere—with the truth, as to human rights—and will he as a slaveholder, dare to justify himself before this community for closer bonds, for heavier oppression, because the friends of liberty have succeeded in making this truth encounter him at every turn? As well might he charge—to our own act of Congress—to the concurrent enactments of European nations, by which the felonious abduction of the native African is made piracy, and punishable with death, and to the humane activity of the British navy in bringing to justice the enemies of the human race,—the renewed enemy and the yet growing atrocities of the African slave-trade; as to charge to the friends of human rights engaged in bringing the heat of truth to bear upon and melt the fetters of the slave, the adamant hardness with which the slaveholder is tempering them anew.

We would here gladly pass by the abusive portion of Mr. Clay's remarks, were we not compelled speedily to encounter what is vastly more exceptionable. Mr. Clay—if his reporter say true—has deliberately enrolled himself among the opponents of free discussion—and consequently, of the Liberty of the Press and of Speech. His assertion, that "no man was more the advocate of the

* In early life Mr. Clay was the public and avowed advocate of emancipation.

right of free discussion than himself," is entitled to no greater weight, than the worn out declaration of the slaveholder, that "he is in favor of emancipation," whilst he holds a score or two of his fellow-creatures in bonds, and is careful to transmit them to his children. Any one can make it. Louis Philippe, doubtless, would feel himself greatly aggrieved, were he to be set down as an enemy to free discussion and to the liberty of the press: yet he puts men in prison, and fines them for its use.

Mr. Clay said, "he had been told, that the people of the non-slaveholding States had a right to discuss the question of Slavery; but he denied the right of discussion on a subject where, politically speaking, there was no right to decide. Discussion was the antecedent to deliberation, deliberation to decision—and the people of the non-slaveholding States had no right to decide on the question of Slavery. It was a matter for the slaveholding States exclusively." A moment's examination of the positions here taken, will show into what absurdities the best minds will fall when passion is permitted to supply its principles.

Mr. Clay would not deny that there is a right to discuss the question of Slavery somewhere. If it be not in the free States, it must be in the slave States. If so, where is the guarantee by which they claim it "exclusively"? It is not in the Constitution of the United States; for this recognizes no difference. If it is on the ground of her sovereignty, Ohio and the other free States are not inferior in dignity and power. If South Carolina should say to Ohio, *You shall not discuss this subject*; would not Ohio have the same right, in virtue of her entire equality, to lay the same embargo on the minds and the tongues of South Carolina! The right to discuss this very question, Ohio used at the institution of her government; and she has not yet surrendered it. In what terms of indignation would not the Convention of this State have replied to the insulting mandate from Virginia, charging them not to discuss a subject belonging exclusively to her and her slaveholding peers! Mr. Clay, it would seem, is outstripping Gov. McDuffie—for even he, it is not to be supposed, would expect us to decide on his recommendation to Ohio to establish slavery, as the best means of preserving her liberty, without having all the advantages that could be derived from Mr. Clay's formal preliminaries, "deliberation" and "discussion."

The reasoning by which Mr. Clay attempts to maintain his position, that the free States have no right to discuss the question of Slavery, is, to the full, as singular—not so ridiculous—as the position itself. To prove it so, we ask nothing more than that he submit to be tried by his own principles—What right, then, had he and the little band around him engaged in shouting his praise when he aimed this blow—ineffectual we trust, against his country—but suicidal to himself, and going to the very life's blood of his fame—what right, we repeat, had they to "decide" on "rights" claimed by Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio! None. They could "decide" nothing. Therefore, by this coarse logic, they had no right to discuss them. Will Mr. Clay remember the time, when—if he was not honored with the name of "fanatic," he was not spared that of *factions oppositionist*—he proposed, and urged on his country with some of the best efforts of his eloquence, a recognition of the independence of the revolted colonies of Spain! Will he remember how he pressed into the foremost rank, in "discussing" in Congress, the cause of the revolted Greeks! And yet Congress could "decide" nothing that would be obligatory on any of the parties: all they could do, was to manifest their love of liberty, and animate by their sympathy, those who were struggling for its enjoyments.

But the principle, as laid down by Mr. Clay, can have no application, at present, to any part of our country. The non-slaveholding States, although they have inhibited slaveholding within their own limits, still, they, equally with the south, are maintaining it in the District of Columbia, and giving it their sanction and approbation on the admission into this Confederacy, of every new State in which this form of oppression is established by its Constitution. Should they at any time desire to bring slavery to a termination in the District of Columbia—to petition for its abolition as a grievance, as they are now doing; and to ask of their Senators and Representatives in Congress their co-operation, surely "discussion" and "deliberation" cannot be denied them. May they not discuss the propriety of petitioning at all? If they may, what more proper to direct them than calm and well authenticated accounts of the evils and benefits of slavery? What would have a juster influence, than the repeated acknowledgment of Mr. Clay, after a personal experience of more than fifty years, of the great injury it was inflicting on our country; or than the official argument of Governor McDuffie, proving it a signal blessing—a religious institution! To deny to the free States the right to discuss the question of Slavery, is, at once, to degrade their constitutional independence below that of the slave States—to say to them, that they have no share in the "exclusive legislation" over the district confided by the Constitution to Congress, and to hand over the Capitol and the ten miles square to be controlled by the well regulated tempers of southern representatives, and to the tender mercies of slaveholding legislation.

Some may find fault with the language of this article, as unnecessarily harsh and severe. To such we reply, it is not with Mr. Clay, but with his sentiments we have to do. Were he without influence, his attack on rights that are "inestimable to freemen," might pass unnoticed. But he stands high in the confidence of his fellow-citizens; to many, his opinions are as oracles. When, then, the barriers of our liberty find in such an one an assailant, it is high time he was met by their defenders, with great plainness of speech, if not sternness of rebuke. Whilst we have lost none of our good will for Mr. Clay personally, we are compelled to acknowledge, that this last act of his has greatly impaired our respect for him as an enlightened statesman, a friend of republican principles at home, and of liberty throughout the world. Much is it to be feared, that with a fatuity which long-continued slaveholding often superinduces over the best minds; with a rashness which calls for commiseration more loudly than any opposing feeling; with a blindness, which will discern no ray of the light now fast breaking in on America, and the whole civilized world, and by which his character, in all its aspects, will be judged; that he has taken the first step to erase his name from the roll of the Sharps, the Clarksons, the Foxes, the Wilberforces, and the Pitts, that he might re-inscribe it on that of the Watsons, the Gascoigns, the McDuffies, the Lumpkins, and the Wises.

CINCINNATI REPUBLICAN.—The following article is from the Cincinnati Republican of the 9th inst.:

We have received the first number of an Abolition paper, printed at New Richmond, Ohio, mis-called the *Philanthropist*. The editor, in his introduction, gives

us to understand, that his original determination was to publish his paper in Cincinnati; but, receiving a hint that the attempt would be attended with serious consequences, he concluded prudence was the better part of valor, and has commenced the promulgation of his incendiary doctrines at New Richmond.

We have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Ramsay, the gentleman, who is, as we are informed, the editor of this journal. Notwithstanding, we expect to be thus greeted by him; for there had been made on us, from several quarters, quite a favorable impression, as to his discretion and sense of propriety. In any notice he should be pleased to take of the *Philanthropist*, we looked for nothing that would justly affect our estimation of him, or, in the least, tend to bring into further disrespect the right of discussion, or the safety of those who would use it, whilst he himself uses it so abundantly, and feels in his own case, how pleasant it is, under the protection he enjoys, to use it fearlessly.

It is not our intention, that any respectable editor shall bring us to trial on an indictment where we are charged in so general a manner with "incendiary doctrines." We shall always call, as we do now, for specifications, so minute, that we can answer them. If convicted, we will make confession of our error, and endeavor to profit by the discovery. But we insist on having pointed out to us, the part of our doctrines, as contained in our first No. that is "incendiary." Is it "incendiary" for us to reply in terms of mildness and forbearance to the resolutions of a southern "vigilance committee"—in which we were traduced, and held up to public obloquy, in company with gamblers, &c.? Is it "incendiary" to object to the outrages committed by the south during the last six months?—To their whippings, their tortures, and their illegal executions of unfriended strangers? Is the south to break through every barrier of law—to trample under foot every constitutional protection to which the citizens of the free States, going into it, are used to confide their persons and their property, and not even a faint murmur of disapprobation be raised? Are the people of the free States to be taunted and insulted by a slaveholding governor, recommending to them in an official document, the establishment of slavery, as the best means of preserving their liberty—are we to hear the demands made on us by the south to put down the freedom of the press and of speech, to surrender our citizens to the mercies of a southern court and jury—to strip ourselves of the blessings of liberty, that they may enjoy the blessings of slavery—is all this we say, to be received from the south, with the quiet submission of their own slaves, and is the man that would raise the voice of enquiry only, forthwith to be cried down as an "incendiary?" We assure Mr. Ramsay, if to cry out for liberty, in the streets, when her enemies have broken open her sanctuary, and are making her sacred things plunder—is to brand us as an incendiary, we plead guilty—trusting that our children after us may be as guilty as we are, whatever may be the consequences.

That both sides may be heard on the subject of slavery, we devote a large portion of the *Philanthropist* to a republication of southern views and arguments. Surely the Editor of the Republican will not object to this—unless, I may be, he is desirous of monopolizing the honor of defending slavery, and of leading the south in its onset on the rights of the north. If he does, we admonish him that the slaveholders can furnish able and older soldiers for this warfare than he—and that as long as they can equip for the field such Goliaths, as Hayne and McDuffie, and Tazewell and Calhoun, to defy their adversaries, they will not greatly need the services of a raw recruit, however burning may be his zeal, or servile his obedience.

A word or two more to Mr. Ramsay: The cause of constitutional liberty—staggered for a little while by the influence of the slaveholding spirit on the *lees* of the people in the eastern cities—is beginning again to stand erect. It has appealed to the people—to the great body of the people—and not in vain. The summons to her rescue is becoming every day more thrilling to those who have no other interest than in its preservation. The fury of the south, displayed through their governors, their legislatures, and their representatives in Congress, is making incendiaries by the thousand. It is making the cause of liberty more precious—the cause of slavery more odious. Be assured, sir, before the revolution of another year, it will be the cause of no small regret to you, that you will not be able to deny the paternity of the little article to which this is a reply.

VAGRANCY.—From the New Hampshire Statesman, we learn that the Rev. M. Storrs, an exemplary and able minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and with whom we have the pleasure of an acquaintance, was arrested, a short time since, at North field, in New Hampshire, on a charge of vagrancy. The fact on which the charge was founded, was, that he preached and lectured to show to his auditors that slaveholding is not only sinful in the sight of God, but injurious to our country.

Truly our friend Storrs has fallen on strange, if not evil times. We congratulate him on his acquittal. But let him look to it that his ingenious countrymen do not prefer a second prosecution, and expose him to the ordeal of being weighed against the Bible, or of being cast into a mill pond, tied hand and foot. We would as soon expect to hear of his being tried under the old law against witchcraft, as under the law against vagrancy. Some spots in New England, seem scarcely yet to have emerged from that state of society in which the first was so effectual.

How difficult it is to convince the people of the nineteenth century, of what took place in the eighteenth! Then it was that slander and reviling, and brick-bats, and bludgeons, and rotten eggs, and mob-law, and state-law, were all fairly tried to put down Wesley, the founder of the religious denomination to which Mr. Storrs is attached, and his little band of determined coadjutors. So it has been thus far, with the great principles of liberty, founded on the true and unalterable relation of things, recognized in the Declaration of Independence, and contended for by abolitionists. In the persecutions of the last two years, is there an instance, where the cause of human rights has not been forwarded? The folly of persecuting any cause, is equal to its wickedness.

Gov. MARCY AND GOV. GAYLE.—The same paper which gives the account of Mr. Storrs' arrest and trial, says it cannot see on what ground the demand made by Gov. Gayle on the Governor of New York for the delivery of Mr. Williams, (a citizen of New York, who, we believe has never been within five hundred miles of Alabama), can be resisted. We will assist in opening his eyes, for him to see, (what probably has been unknown to him heretofore,) that part of the Constitution of the United States which says, "a person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be

delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime."

Governor Marcy has read the horn book of our rights to better purpose, in our judgment, than the Editor of the N. H. Statesman—having refused to deliver up Mr. Williams to be removed to Alabama. For the speedy and peaceful termination of slavery in the south, nothing more is wanting on the part of the free States, but a calm, deliberate maintenance of their constitutional rights. Such a course will soon dissipate the froth, which, on the subject of slavery, has covered up the good sense that is in the south, and prevented it from devising the means, which it will then soon discover, for getting rid of slavery.

THE CINCINNATI ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—Held its first annual meeting on Tuesday, 5th instant, at the school room of Mr. Alexander Kinnmont, classical teacher. The chair was taken at 7 o'clock, P. M. by the President, JAMES C. LUDLOW.

The Treasurer's report—(annexed)—was read and received. Also the report of the Depository Committee—who have entered into an arrangement with Messrs. TRUMAN & SMITH, booksellers, Main Street, to sell anti-slavery publications on commission.

Mr. Birney, who had been appointed for that purpose at a previous meeting of the Executive Committee, delivered a lecture, in which he attempted to answer many of the objections made to the right, on the part of the free States to discuss the subject of slavery, as well as those to the course pursued by the American Anti-Slavery Society.

The Declaration of Sentiment and Constitution of the Society were then read, and several gentlemen of those present became members.

Several of the members made contributions to the funds of the society—others pledged themselves to contribute certain sums, at regular periods.

Officers chosen for the ensuing year:—

JAMES C. LUDLOW,	President,
ISAAC COLBY,	1. Vice Pres't,
WILLIAM T. TRUMAN,	2. Vice Pres't,
JAMES G. BIRNEY,	Cor. Sec.
GAM'L BAILEY, JR.,	Rec. Sec.
WILLIAM DONALDSON,	Treasurer.

MANAGERS.
John Melendy, Ben'j Bassett,
F. A. Sayre, J. C. Clopper,
C. Donaldson, A. Hopkins,
M. R. Robinson, Thomas Maylin,
Rees E. Price, Wm. Holyoke.

TREASURER'S REPORT,
Cincinnati Anti-Slavery Society, in account with Wm. DONALDSON, Treasurer.

To cash remitted to R. G. Williams, for publications,	\$230 75
To cash paid Exchange on the above,	1 50
" " Postage,	11 67
" " Freight, &c. on publications,	5 23
" " Blank Books, &c.,	1 88
" " Remitted to R. G. Williams, in part of \$150 pledged to the A. A. S. S.	55 00
" " Printing,	6 00
Cash—balance on hand,	30 07
	\$342 20
By Cash rec'd on subscription for Depository,	\$102 97
" " for Publications sold,	83 73
" " on loan, to be repaid out of the sale of publications,	100 50
" " of A. Wattles,	55 00
	\$242 20

Cincinnati, Jan. 5th, 1835.

WM. DONALDSON, Treasurer.

Miscellaneous.

From the New-York Evangelist.
DUEY OF CHARACTER.

Some men have a spirit of decision which will not suffer them to remain neutral on any question of importance. No sooner is such a case presented to a man of this character, than a hasty decision is followed by immediate energetic action. This haste may sometimes throw him on the wrong side, and he may be the means of much harm; still, such an one, however blundering, cannot fail if his motives be right, of accomplishing far more good in the course of his life, than one of those who will do nothing for fear of doing wrong. And when they are right in their plans and methods, this promptness and energy of character are truly invaluable.

The apostle Paul was a man of this stamp. No sooner has he completed his education, than, being "exceedingly zealous" of the law, he enters upon a scheme for exterminating Christianity. It is not probable that he engaged in this enterprise without some consideration. We may imagine him consulting with some of the chief priests, better acquainted than himself with the sect to be suppressed. "What are they?" enquires the young Pharisee. "They are fanatics and enthusiasts," answers an old priest, "who maintain opinions too absurd to be refuted." "They are disorganizers," says another, "for wherever their doctrines prevail, the son dishonors his father, the daughter raiseth up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man's foes are of his own household." "Their doctrines are incendiary, and make a tumult among the people," adds a third, who had lent his own influence to these mobs to suppress arguments he could not answer, and who did not seem to see the monstrous injustice of charging the guilt of a mob to its victims. "They are traitors, and will cause the Romans to come and take away both our place and our nation," rejoined the fourth, who enjoyed a fat office by the favor of the oppressors of his nation. "Nor is the character of their leaders," adds another, "better than their principles. Matthew the publican, was one of the most notorious speculators in all Galilee. Can such a man advocate the truth?" "Another acknowledged leader," continues a fifth, "is a perjurer, who once disavowed the sect under oath." "This same Peter," adds a sixth, "uses the most opprobrious epithets the Hebrew language can furnish. He calls our whole nation murderers." "Their professed Head and Founder was always offensive to the people," says the seventh. "It is in evidence," says the eighth, "that he threatened to destroy the temple of our holy religion. And worse than that, he called our most venerable men and purest pharisees hypocrites," says the ninth. "Nay," says the tenth, "his projects of destruction were boundless. It is in evidence, that he threatened to kindle a fire upon the earth. His very words were taken down, *What will I if it be already kindled?*" Then follow in quick succession other charges, such as malice can at any time pick up, blacker if possible, though less authentic. The well known history of Judas serves for the conclusion.

Such probably was the information on which Paul founded his opinion of the Christian system. As he considers the standing of his informers, men venerable for their age—men of tried character and high ecclesiastical standing, (the D. D.'s of their day,) can he doubt the justice of their allegations? He receives his commission and withdraws. So far his guilt appears comparatively small. He has acted ignorantly and in unbelief. True, a hasty decision

is wrong. But in another aspect he appears more deeply guilty. Suppose Christianity false, in this respect he was not the less guilty because it was false. Paul knew that the Christians were MEN—that they had the rights of men. He would have shrunk with horror from the idea of robbing them of their money by false imprisonment and beating. But he was willing to take from them by violence a right far dearer than money, the right of expressing and defending their opinions, and complying with the duties of their consciences toward God. He sought by this means to avoid a gulph of anarchy into which he supposed the nation about to plunge, believing probably, the end would justify the means. But "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Little did the sanhedrim think that their children must drain the dregs from the bitter cup their fathers had mingled for the Christians. But in vain do persecutors pray for deliverance when persecuted in their turn. The spirit of persecution is always the same. It is the atmosphere in which tyrants draw their breath. It renders hatred desperate. Paul was so full of it that he breathed out threatenings and slaughter, so exceeding mad was he against the Christians, that not even women could escape his fury. His whole character can be summed up in two words of his own—he was a "persecutor and injurious."

But of whatever injury his natural impetuosity made him the cause, this same trait afterwards made ample amends for it. After his conversion, his decision of character was as conspicuous as before. He declared the truth with such energy and success, that he was charged with having "turned the world upside down." He could address an infuriated multitude till they "cried out and threw off their clothes and cast dust in the air." Four times he suffered the penalty of the *Lynch-law* of that day. Thrice whipped, once stoned, but still he persevered in preaching the truth however unwelcome, in every city and village till the mockery since misnamed the majesty of the people, compelled him to fly for his life.

Paul was no fence man. He was ready to commit himself at once to what he believed to be the truth. He was a true radical!—presenting a noble contrast to the calculating, temporizing spirit of expediency.

ELACHISTOS.
Amherst College, Nov. 6th, 1835.

IDENTITY OF SLAVERY.
The Christian Register contains an extract from an English periodical, of which the following is a portion:—

"We have been much struck, in the perusal of the debates (upon the Slave Trade) by the identity of tone and sophism between the pro-slavery men of that day and their successors in the present. Lord Thurlow talked pathetically, not of the murder of the slaves, but of the ruin of the traders; Lord Sidney eulogized the tender legislation of Jamaica; the Duke of Chandos deprecated universal insurrection; and the Duke of Richmond proposed a clause of compensation!"

We have sometimes thought that a useful book might be compiled on the history of opinions on the slavery question in England, beginning with the early age when the Saxon nobles were in the habit of selling their own serfs, and tracing down the successive steps by which first the slave-trade in the serfs—next, the slavery of the serf—then the slave-trade in negroes—and finally the slavery of the negroes, have been utterly abolished in the English territories, and the grand principle fully established there, that man can have no rightful property in man. It will be found not only that the arguments of the slave-traders fifty years ago, and of the slave-holders now, are substantially the same—that both have attempted to sustain their cause by considerations of interests and expediency, by avowals of right, and by arguments drawn from the perverted word of God—but it will also be found, that precisely the same arguments were used in England in the fourteenth century, in defense of white slavery, and that they proved ineffectual against the advancing light of reason and justice. The celebrated insurrection headed by Wat Tyler in 1380—so much misrepresented by Hume and writers like him—was in fact an insurrection of the English slaves, who had been ground to the dust by the exactions and restraints of their lords, and who demanded merely a release from those exactions and restraints. To use their own language, as reported by Friarist, they demanded of the King that he should "free them from forever—themselves, their children, and their goods; and that they should no longer be called serfs, nor held in bondage, and that if they worked for the lords, they should be paid for it."

The king of whom these demands were made, (Richard 2d, then 16 years of age) was obliged to grant them. But the grant was extorted not from a sense of justice, but from the personal fear excited by the hoarse cries and brandished weapons of sixty thousand peasants who were determined to be free or die. Most of them dispersed after the concession was made; their leader was then treacherously slain; his immediate followers, deprived of their general and miserably armed, were butchered by the mailed Norman chivalry; between force and treachery the peasants were completely subdued, and then the pledge which had been given on the faith of a king, was unshrinkingly broken. The lords and chevaliers were then appealed to by the king to know whether they would confirm the charters of enfranchisement which he had granted. "God preserve us," answered they, "from subscribing to such charters, though we were all to perish in one day; for we would rather lose our lives than our inheritance." How similar is this to the language of the innumerable resolutions of the slaveholders of the present day, all pledging themselves to perish rather than give up their property.

Yet even in that age, which we are accustomed to call benighted, and in spite of the unprincipled claims of the majority, there were many among the slaveholders themselves who repented of the sin they were committing against the laws of God and the rights of man, who exhibited the most unequivocal testimonials of their repentance. The following passage is from Thierry's History of the Norman Conquest (a history which is equalled in clearness and philosophic reach of thought only by those of Turner and Niebuhr.)

"Notwithstanding the failure of the great effort which they (the serfs) had made to escape all at once from servitude, and to destroy the distinction of conditions which had succeeded the distinction of races, the natural movement which tended gradually to diminish that distinction, went on without interruption; and the individual enfranchisements, which had begun to be granted long before that period, thenceforward became more frequent. The idea of the injustice of servitude in itself—whatever its origin—whether ancient or recent,—this great idea, which had been the untiring bond of the conspiracy of 1381, and to which the instinct of liberty had elevated the peasantry before the gentlemen,—communicated itself even to the latter. In those moments of life when reaction becomes calmer and more profound—when reason speaks more powerfully than interest and avarice—in moments of domestic grief, of sickness, and of danger—the nobles thought that the evil which they experienced or apprehended was, perhaps, a punishment for the evil which they were doing to other men; and they repented of having serfs, as of a thing displeasing to God, who had created all men to his own image and likeness. Many deeds of enfranchisement in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, bear the following preamble:—'Seeing that in the beginning God made all men by nature free, and that afterwards the law of nations placed certain of them under the yoke of servitude,—we think it would be pious and meritorious in the sight of God, to liberate such persons to us subjected in villanage, and to free them entirely from such services. Know, therefore, that we have freed and liberated from all yoke of servi-

tude,—our knaves, of the manor of —, them and all their children, born or to be born.'"

"These sort of deeds, which, during the fifteenth century, were very frequent, and of which we find no instance in anterior times, indicate the birth of a sort of public spirit contrary to the violent results of the Conquest, and which seems to have developed itself at one and the same time in the descendants of the Normans and in those of the English, at the period when, in the minds of both, all clear tradition of the historical origin of their respective situations was effaced."

These philanthropists, who at this time despond and doubt whether the stain of slavery can be effaced from this land by any means we now possess, should recall the history of the past, and take heart in seeing how the innate conviction of right has in all past times finally triumphed over the claims of power and the suggestions of expediency in relation to this subject.

The whole history of the subject for eighteen hundred years, shows a constant improving tone of public sentiment. The Anglo-Saxon nobility (see Bancroft's History United States) tempted by the high prices given for young and beautiful English slaves, claimed and exercised the right of selling their serfs into foreign countries. This practice at one time cruelly prevalent, was protested against by the church, became obnoxious to public opinion, and was at length sullenly relinquished. Then came the rebellions of the serfs to secure freedom on their own soil; and after a long struggle, their freedom was achieved. Then came the slave trade in negroes; it was attacked, on fair ground of principle, by a meek and unworldly sect (the Quakers); and after a struggle in which very much the same feeling was excited and the same arguments used as are now exhibited in the abolition contest, the right cause triumphed, and the English Empire took a step which has resulted in the prohibition of the slave trade by every civilized nation. Within a year or two that great nation has completed the work, by the abolition of negro slavery throughout her dominions. And we fully believe that our southern States will not be able ten years longer to withstand this example, and the influence of free discussion and the searching appeals of the north and west.—*Franklin Mercury.*

TO THE HON. THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED.

Petition of ladies resident in — County, State of —

Fathers and Rulers of our Country:—Suffer us, we pray you, with the sympathies which we are constrained to feel as wives, as mothers, and as daughters, to plead with you in behalf of a long oppressed and deeply injured class of native Americans, residing in that portion of our country which is under your exclusive control. We should poorly estimate the virtues which ought ever to distinguish your honorable body, could we anticipate any other than a favorable hearing, when our appeal is to men, to philanthropists, to patriots, to the legislators and guardians of a Christian people. We should be less than women, if the nameless and unnumbered wrongs of which the slaves of our sex are made the defenceless victims, did not fill us with horror and constrain us, in earnestness and agony of spirit, to pray for their deliverance. By day and by night, their woes and their wrongs rise up before us, throwing shades of mournful contrast over the joys of domestic life, and filling our hearts with sadness at the recollection of those whose hearths are desolate.

Nor do we forget, in the contemplation of their other sufferings, the intellectual and moral degradation to which they are doomed; how the soul formed for companionship with angels, is despoiled and brutified, and consigned to ignorance, pollution, and ruin.

Surely then, as the representative of a people professedly Christian, you will bear with us when we express our solemn apprehensions in the language of the patriotic Jefferson, "we tremble for our country when we remember that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep forever," and when in obedience to a divine command "we remember them who are in bonds as bound with them." Impelled by these sentiments, we solemnly purpose, the grace of God assisting, to importune high Heaven with prayer, and our national Legislature with appeals, until this Christian people abjure forever a traffic in the souls of men, and the groans of the oppressed no longer ascend to God from the dust where now they welter.

We do not ask your honorable body to transcend your constitutional powers, by legislating on the subject of slavery within the boundaries of any slaveholding State; but we do conjure you to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, where you exercise exclusive jurisdiction. In the name of humanity, justice, equal rights and impartial law, our country's weal, her honor and her cherished hopes, we earnestly implore for this our humble petition, your favorable regard. If both in Christian and in heathen lands, kings have revoked their edicts at the intercession of woman, and tyrants have relented when she appeared a suppliant for mercy, surely we may hope that the legislators of a free, enlightened, and Christian people, will lend their ear to our appeals, when the only boon we crave, is the restoration of rights unjustly wrested from the innocent and defenseless. And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

The excellent form of petition above, was written by a lady of Putnam, Ohio, who formerly resided in North Carolina. It is decidedly the best we have seen.—*Ed. Eman.*

"We have now completed our chain of scriptural proofs, perfect, we apprehend, in every link, and without a flaw in its connexion. Both the Old and New Testament concur in permitting, sanctioning, and upholding slavery—God and the Patriarchs in the one, Christ and his Apostles in the other, lend to his relations the added sanctions of religion—of the old and new covenants. It is not shoddy or impious to denounce the institution of slavery as irreligious or anti-Christian—what neither God nor Christ has any where condemned in the Jewish or the Christian scriptures, cannot be a crime against religion, nature or humanity—what God and Patriarchs, Christ and Apostles permitted in church members, cannot be denounced as morally wrong, and stigmatized as criminal by any mere man, without insulting the majesty of heaven."—*Charleston Mercury.*

The editor of the Mercury, if we have been correctly informed is—if not an elder,—a member of the Presbyterian Church.

WASHINGTON COUNTY, N. Y.—The convention met at Argyle, in the Baptist meeting-house. During the adjournment for dinner, a mob took possession of the house and refused the convention admittance in the afternoon. They were, however, accommodated by Mr. Carl, keeper of a hotel, with the use of his hall, and he would not suffer them to be disturbed by the rabble. The resolutions are spirited, as might be expected in such circumstances. For instance:—

Resolved, That the system of slavery, being wicked, inhuman, and unjust, and a universally acknowledged usurpation of the rights given by God to man, is our duty, as well as our just prerogative, to condemn its existence at least in a land of freedom, and under just and impartial laws.—*Even.*

ANTI-SLAVERY FUNDS.—The friends of the anti-slavery cause will see, that after the prodigious calamity which has overwhelmed our city, the funds for carrying on the operations of the society in future, must ALL come from other places, and chiefly from the country, which will be less involved in the loss than the commercial cities.—*Evangelist.*

Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?—MALACHI II. 10.

6th. Because the expense of exportation would be intolerable.

6th. Because all plans of colonization hitherto adopted, and it is presumable that no efforts have been spared, have proved miserable abortions—the

7th. Because the weight of the southern States in the federal council would, from the consequent loss of representation, be weakened and destroyed. (19)

8th. Because, exportation would be ruin—after ruin to our slaves themselves. It would be the direct cruelty that could be inflicted on a race of unoffending mortals. It would be sending them forth to beggary and starvation, or to perish horribly in mutual slaughter.

They could not be emancipated and suffered to remain.

1st. Because this would bring upon our slaves many, and upon ourselves all, the evils attendant on emancipation and exportation.

2d. Because, the negro is, from his intellectual and moral organization, incapable of being civilized, or of enjoying freedom; utterly incompetent to become a citizen of a civilized community.

3d. Because, instead of being (as they now are,) peaceable, industrious, well-regulated and happy beings, they would become unruly, idle, turbulent, and wretched beyond description.

4th. Because they never could participate in the rights and privileges of the white citizens. So far from rising to refinement in life, they would corrupt the principles of one half of our population, and drag them down—down to their own depraved, degraded and disgusting condition! (20)

But there is one consequence—certain and inevitable—arising from emancipating and retaining our slaves, which the eager and zealous disciples of abolition and universal emancipation seem to be incapable of understanding.

All history shows that the same country cannot contain free races of men, too distinct and different to amalgamate, without destruction to one or the other, or both. (21) See it in the fate of the aborigines of this country. So long as the color remained, (if all the causes of difference could be removed,) there could be no union. The contest would lead to a fierce and desperate struggle for supremacy, ending in the extermination of one or the other, or both!—Cold must be the bosom—Satan-like the heart of him who can contemplate such a prospect without dismay and horror.

Yet such would be the result—the inevitable result of the alternative to exportation.

It does appear to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is in this matter a stern necessity beyond our control. The thing can be done. Our colored population can cease to be slaves by being chased out of the State—our white population can cease to be masters “by running away from their homes or submitting their throats to the knife. But it cannot be” done without destruction to slave and master—it cannot be done without plunging our happy State into ruin—it cannot be done without sacrificing all that we value, all that we love, and all that we reverence as freemen, as parents, as citizens of South Carolina. If this be not necessity, then words have lost their meaning.

We have no alternative or choice. Give it as granted that slavery is an evil, which I totally deny—give it as granted that slavery is a crime, which is libelous and false—to us and to our slaves there is no relief but ruin—no antidote but death. For us to part from this species of property, must be regarded as an impossibility.

Those who may imagine that any change is to be effected in our domestic policy, might as well talk of making the Edisto run backwards—they might as well talk of picking up Barnwell District and chucking it to the other side of the Savannah—they might as well talk of travelling in a steam car to the moon! or (to use more solemn language) they might as well talk of blowing up the foundation of our state, or of thrusting us (slaves and masters) into one common grave.—Evangelist.

(To be continued.)

NOTES.

(19) Our plan would give the southern States a fair representation instead of a partial one. It would make a full man out of every two thirds of a man.

(20) Four assertions but no proof.

(21) This does not apply, because the amalgamation has commenced already. Ecce Signum. Last year, Dr. Rufus Haywood, of Raleigh, N. C. pursued and took a slave in New York, who was his OWN COUSIN. “Satan like,” indeed, must be the heart that can make color a ground of hatred. If this argument prove true, earth is hell, and men are devils!

Dough-Face Department.

From the Cleveland Herald.

ANTI-ABOLITION MEETING.

At an unusually numerous and highly respectable meeting of the inhabitants of Willoughby, convened at the academy, on Saturday evening, December 26th, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of permitting certain abolition lectures by a Mr. Alvord, in that place—Daniel Christy, Esq. was called to the chair, Lewis R. Meeks and Andrew Hood, Esqrs. were appointed secretaries.

The meeting was addressed at some length, by Daniel Walsh, and other citizens, explanatory of the objects, designs and highly censurable course of the abolitionists.

On motion of Dr. Walsh, it was unanimously Resolved, That whereas, by the Constitution of the United States, the subject of slavery has been committed entirely to the government of the several States in which it exists; and whereas, the agitation of the subject of immediate emancipation at the present time, would have the unhalloved effect of placing us in a hostile attitude towards our brethren of the south. Therefore—

Resolved, that we view with indignation mingled with regret, the arrival in this place of a disseminator of doctrines alike injurious to the interests of the black population, and subversive of the harmony of the Union.

Resolved, That Mr. Alvord be requested to withdraw his presence from the room immediately, and from our village as soon as possible.

On motion of the Hon. Simeon Fuller,

Resolved, that after the close of this meeting, we as citizens, will separate and retire to our respective homes.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Cleveland Herald, Cleveland Advertiser, and Painesville Telegraph.

The meeting was then adjourned, after giving three cheers for the Union.

Between two and three hundred persons were present at the meeting; and the greatest good order and unanimity prevailed.

DANIEL CHRISTY, Ch'n.

LEWIS R. MECKS, Sec'y.

ANDREW HOOD,

EFFECTS OF SLAVERY UPON THE CHURCH.—What are the benefits that slavery has conferred upon the church, in return for its Christian baptism, and its hearty welcome to the communion of the saints? It builds anew and sanctifies the heathen barrier of caste, and while her prayers and her arms traverse oceans to find heathen in the ends of the earth, it shuts up her bowels against the heathen at her own door, and of her own creation; and, as if to make the church the derision of scoffers, it grants her special indulgence to make heathen at home for her own benefit, provided, by way of penance, she contributes a tithe of the profit for the conversion of heathen abroad.—Ohio Declaration.

Mr. Thome, of Kentucky, once said,—“The plantations of the south are grave-yards of the mind—the inexpressive countenances of the slaves are monuments of souls expired,—and their spiritless eyes are their epitaphs.”

What mean ye that ye beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor? saith the Lord God of hosts.—JEREMIAH—the Prophet of the Lord.

Poetry.

SLAVERY.

Extract from a poem written by Wm. P. Palmer, and spoken before the Anti-Slavery Society of Williams College.

Ask of the rolling spheres that fly

In the deep blue skies away.

Far as creation's boundary.

What sceptre y' obey?

And they shall sing in their loudest strain—

On, on—we wear no tyrant's chain!

Ask of the winds before whose might

The clouds in their splendor flee,

And the eagle stoops from his daring height—

Whose ruffian slaves are ye?

And the winds shall shout, as they rush amain,

In their pride of strength, We wear no chain!

Ask of the waves whose pearls are wrung

Forth in earth's farthest clime,

Where are the fetters that Canute flung

Upon your march sublime?

And as they sweep on gloriously,

Thou shalt be answered—We are free!

Question the tempest in his hour

Of darkness and of gloom:

Questions the thunder's awful power—

—The Monarch of the tomb!

Whose are the chains around you wrought?

And they will answer, Thine are not.

Ask of the jocund birds that wing

Their flight in every zone,

O'er tropic bowers where smiles the spring

In one unceasing blossoming:

Or arctic wastes where winter's form

Cureers amid the darkling clime,

And spring is never known—

Yea, ask the birds, whose vassals ye?

And the woods shall echo, We are free.

But ask not man if he be free

From slavery's cankering blight,

Unnumbered groans shall answer thee

E'en in this age of light—

Be silent thou, nor question him,

—Creation's saddest wreck—

His chain is on his brother's limb,

His foot upon his neck.

Yet hush! whence is that solemn tone

That thrills the startled ear?

It is a nation's pagan moan

Around some tyrant's bier?

Comes it from Europe's crimsoned coasts,

Where navies fight and armies opposing,

Or her blasted plains where Tartar hosts

With the Moslem are fearfully closing?

Oh no, it comes from our own loved home,

The land of the pilgrim sires,

Where freedom hath reared her proudest dome,

And kindled her living fires;

Yea, while their beacon glory lies

Like sunbeams o'er her plains,

A nation breathes its deepening sighs,

And clanks her awful chains!

Northern Spirit.

WHAT THEY WOULD DO IF THEY COULD.

ADDRESSED TO THE FREE LABORERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

“The slaves of the south are better off than the laboring poor of the north.”—So say the sullen apologists of slavery, both at the north and the south. What do they mean by it? Why, evidently, that it is right for the aristocracy of the south to hold the laboring people as slaves, because, as they say, a fair comparison between the north and the south has proved that the laboring classes are better off in slavery than in freedom! The slave, they allege, is exempted from “the corroding anxieties” of life, because he has a master to provide for him. These are the very words of some northern editors on the subject, and it becomes the duty of the free laboring people of the north, to understand their full import and bearing.

“Slaves are better off than free laborers!”—These are the premises. “There is, therefore, no sin in holding laborers in slavery against their will!”—This is the conclusion. A very bold assertion: a very summary process of logic: a very sweeping and comprehensive conclusion! A conclusion that would enslave the free laborers of the north!

Let it carefully be noticed, in the first place, that the statement is not merely a comparison between the colored slaves at the south, and the colored free laborers at the north. No. The statement is usually made to include especially the operatives of our cotton and woolen manufactories, nearly all of whom are white people—male and female—parents and children. The white manufacturers of Birmingham and Leeds in England, as well as those of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, have repeatedly been named by the opponents of emancipation, in this very connexion. The statement is, therefore, NOT that COLORED men are worse off in freedom than in slavery, but that WHITE PEOPLE—yes—the free white citizens of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, are WORSE OFF than the COLORED SLAVES of South Carolina and Alabama!

And let it be noticed, carefully, in the second place, that the logic and the conclusion of the anti-emancipation writers and orators, are as broad and unrestricted as their premises. In the very nature of the case it must be so. And nothing to the contrary has been pretended by those who apologize for slavery in this manner. They cannot show that there is any difference between white and colored laborers in this matter. They have not attempted to make any such distinction; and it does not appear that they wish to make any. Their broad position relates to the comparative condition of free and enslaved laborers; and they assert the advantage to be on the side of the enslaved! In all this, there is no reference made to the color of the laborer, any more than to the color of his eyes or his garments, and it would be evidently ridiculous to predicate anything on such a distinction. Such a distinction is, in fact, excluded by the very persons whose logic we are considering. At least, they make no distinction in favor of the white laborer. For it is the white laborer, according to their account of the matter, who falls beneath the condition of the colored laborer. But as these reasoners are themselves white people, it cannot be supposed that they intend to intimate that the degraded and miserable condition of the free laborers of the north was owing to their white color! No. The plain drift of their argument has nothing to do with color. The comparative advantages or disadvantages of slavery and freedom, to the welfare of the laboring poor, is the only point at issue in the discussion. And the stereotyped plea of slavery at the head of this article goes the full length of declaring, that the condition of the free laborer, even though a white man, is more degraded and miserable than that of the negro slave of the south, and, therefore, the southern capitalist commits no sin when he holds the laborer, without his consent, as a slave. The inference irresistibly follows, that it could be NO SIN for the NORTHERN capitalist to hold the NORTHERN WHITE LABORER, without his consent, as A SLAVE!

Very possibly the southern laborers would form a different estimate of the comparative advantages of their condition, if allowed to decide the case for themselves. The numerous advertisements for runaway slaves may furnish some hints on this point, as well as the pathetic appeals in respect to the dangers of a servile insurrection. And there is some reason to apprehend that our northern mechanics and manufacturers have not quite arrived at the conclusion, that they would be “better off” in the condition of slavery, since none of them are known to have manifested any solicitude to escape from the “corroding anxieties of life,” by becoming slaves. But the sentiments of the laboring people themselves do not appear to be taken at all into the account, by our American nobility, either at the north or the south. They seem to take it for granted that their own estimates of the condition of the laboring people are amply sufficient to decide every question in respect to the condition to be assigned them. And they regard as little the commandments of God, as they do the wishes and cries of the despised poor. “He that stealeth a man, or if he be found in his hand,” is condemned as a transgressor, by the unchanging moral law. “He that useth his neighbor's service, without wages,” finds no apology in the records of revealed truth. But what is all this to the lordly supervisors of the American laboring poor? “They have set their mouth against the heavens, and their tongue walketh through the earth.” They have duly estimated the comparative condition of the free and the enslaved poor; and whatever their Creator may have said on the subject, they have settled and promulgated their decision, that the laboring poor of America are “better off” in slavery, than they are in a state of freedom! The degradation of the northern white laborers beneath the level of the southern negro slaves, they pretend, has fully demonstrated this fact, and therefore there is no sin in holding stolen men, and using the laborer's service without wages, notwithstanding the explicit prohibitions of Jehovah!

If the enslaved laborer of the south is “better off” than the free laborer of the north, and if this consideration makes it right and merciful to hold the southern laborer as a slave, then righteousness and mercy not only permit, but require that the white laborer of the north should likewise be held as a slave. This must certainly be the case, unless the white laborers of the north have less claims on the kindness of their wealthy countrymen than the colored laborers of the south!

The sum of the matter is, then, this:—He who holds the laborer as a slave at the south, would hold the laborer as a slave at the north, if he could. They who hold colored laborers as slaves, would as readily hold white laborers as slaves. This has been done in Europe, and would be done in America if the aristocracy had the power. And that power they will unquestionably have, if their only effective opponents, the immediate abolitionists, can be “put down.” The equality and inalienable rights of all men must be practically maintained, or there is no security for inalienable rights.

Let the free laborers of the north, irrespective of color, consider and understand this matter. The great and only question is—whether the laboring classes shall be free? The circumstance of color (!) has nothing to do with the question, any more than stature, or phrenological conformation of skull. The opponents of emancipation so understand the matter; they argue the question without the least reference to such circumstances; their arguments are as forcible in favor of white slavery as black; they go for the principle that laborers, without respect to color, are “better off” (!) in slavery than in freedom! They even quote the condition of the free WHITE operatives in our northern manufactories to prove this position! Incredible insolence! Who would have believed, a few years since, that an aristocracy like this could have arisen up in America, powerful enough to control the public press, and forbid free discussion! The opposition to slavery has been detected and drawn it out. And now is the time, if ever, to grapple with and overcome it.

“Free laborers ‘worse off’ than slaves!”—Who believes it? Mechanics and working men of the north! Do you believe it? Listen to your traducers. Learn the estimate that the opponents of abolition have made of you, in order to sustain their cause. They say you are *worse degraded* than the negro slaves! That the slaves would be “worse off” if they were in your condition! You see, then, how much the opponents of abolitionists respect you! And yet these lily-fingered gentry will perhaps cringe to you when they want your votes. Oh, yes! Then, for a day or two, you are “the sovereign people,” even in their eyes! They can profess to be republicans! And yet they seek to establish the principle—that the laboring people are “better off” to be slaves, than to be free! And they have the effrontery to say that your example and condition shows that liberty is not a blessing to the laboring man! The great Virginia statesman, Mr. Leigh, has long ago denied that the laboring people of any country can be fit for a participation in the affairs of government. But, now, the northern press is wielded by northern men, to tell the world that northern laborers would be “better off” if they were reduced to the condition of southern slaves!

“Laboring people of the north! listen!”—Do you think you should be “better off” to be “held as mere goods and chatties, in the hands of your owners and possessors, their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever,” and “entirely subject to the will of the master to whom you belong?” Do you think you would be “better off” under the irresponsible and capricious control of the individual (whether wise or foolish, whether drunken or sober, whether Christian or infidel) who chanced, for the time being, to be your “owner,” than you now are, with the exercise of your free volition, squaring your actions by the dictates of your own conscience in the light of God's law? “Better off” to be “subject entirely to the will” of a sinful man, than to be subject to Him who hath said—“Thou shalt have no other gods before me?”

Would you be “better off” than you now are, if placed under a code which should deny your right to make any contract, even the contract of marriage? A code which says “the slave is not entitled to the conditions of matrimony?” A code which knows neither husband, nor wife, nor parent, nor child! A code which blots out the fifth and seventh commandments! Would you be “better off” if your wife and child might be sold from your embraces, or you from their's, whenever it suited the convenience of your “owner” to sell either of you? Would you be “better off” to be driven to labor with the cartwhip, instead of being drawn by the stimulus of wages—fifteen hours in summer and fourteen in winter—fed with “one quart of corn per day,” and clothed with “one linen shirt and pantaloons for the summer, and a linen shirt and woolen great coat and pantaloons for the winter?” Would you be “better off” under a code which allowed you to enter no complaint against your master for any ill treatment—and which prevented you and all your relatives from giving any testimony in a court of justice against your master and his relatives? A code which gave you no redress for any outrage committed on your person, except the consolatory reflection, that your master, if he pleased, might recover a fine, for his own use, of the person who had injured you, (!) in case it could be proved that you had been disabled for labor? A code which kindly provides for the punishment of him who shall “maliciously and wilfully” kill you, “unless such death should happen by accident in giving”

Mechanics and working men of the north!—Do you believe all this? You must believe it if you believe that “the slaves of the south are better off” than yourselves. If you really do believe this, then you will do well to give your countenance and support to those whom the sentiment is advocated. If you really think yourselves below the level of the southern slaves, and envy their condition, you ought, by all means, to show your gratitude to those whose “tender mercies” would elevate you to the same rank, and rescue you from all the “corroding anxieties” of freedom! In such a case you will pardon the seeming contempt with which they rank you now, below the slaves, when you recollect that it is not their desire or intention that you should long remain there. The principles they have laid down, the arguments they urge, and the measures they pursue, untidily indicate their solicitude to give you the very condition they consider best adapted to your wants and circumstances! The southern slaves, they say, are “better off” at present than you are. Far be it from me to intimate, that they are not as “kindly affectioned” towards you as towards the slaves. They will undoubtedly place you in the same condition in which they say the slave had better be continued, as soon as it shall be in their power to do so. It would be an impeachment of their abundant professions of Christian wisdom and philanthropy to think otherwise. Indeed, it is evident that their plans and efforts in your behalf are already making great progress. They have said that you are in a worse condition than the slave. And they have said it so loudly, and so frequently, and through so many channels of polite and Christian literature, that many intelligent and influential minds have received the statement as a reality. And this supposed fact they have uniformly traced to your unfortunate enjoyment of freedom. The slave, they say, must remain a slave, for fear his freedom should prove as great a curse to him as they allege your freedom has proved to you! Who ever is influenced by their reasonings, is prepared to believe a benefit would be conferred on you by your reduction to slavery! And what but “public opinion” is wanting, to sanction such an operation? Your own consent will be as little enquired after, as the preference of the slave, by those who may possess the power, and on the same principle, viz: that the employers are the sole judges of the best condition of the employed. Freedom of speech and of the press appear to be the remaining barriers against slavery. These were never allowed to the favored race at the south, who are accounted to be so much “better off” than you are! And hopeful progress is already making by the same kind friends to place you in a similar condition. If then you feel grateful for their kindness, be careful to second their efforts. Patronize and sustain the papers that oppose the immediate emancipation of the slaves. They cannot fail to inculcate, directly or indirectly, the doctrine that laborers are “better off” in slavery than in freedom. And whenever this doctrine obtains ascendancy, there will be nothing to prevent laborers of all colors from being enslaved. Already a northern capitalist who has traveled and vended his wares at the south has proclaimed, to the honor of the planters, that they treat their slaves as well as he treats the operatives in his own manufactory at the north. In other words, the gentleman has done all in his power to reduce his laborers to the condition of slaves. This is his own account of the matter—and common report has not contradicted his testimony.

In a word, if the laboring population of the north consider the condition of slavery an enviable one, and wish to participate in its benefits, let them not fail to oppose with their might, the present effort for the abolition of slavery in this land. The struggle is between the antagonist principles of free and slave labor. They cannot much longer co-exist. One must prevail to the destruction of the other. The laborers of America will either be free or enslaved. The laborers at the south will be free, or the laborers at the north will lose their freedom. This is as certain as that moral causes cannot exist and operate without producing effects. As certain as that light accompanies the sun, and darkness follows its withdrawal. The laboring population of the north have it now in their power to turn the scale which way they please. On which side will they place themselves!—Emancipator.

Pro-Slavery Ecclesiastics.

From the Evangelist.

THE SOUTHERN CLERGY.

We para ny vane for the following letter:—

“SAVANNAH, NOV. 9, 1835.

“Rev. Joshua Leavitt.—Sir:—The mail of last Saturday brought me a copy of ‘the New York Evangelist,’ dated October 31st, which contains an account of certain meetings of abolitionists. It has been my uniform practice to return all such incendiary publications to their authors, when known, or to the post-master, as rejected documents, when anonymous; and I hold it to be the duty of every good citizen, and especially of every Christian, to resist the influence which deluded men at the north are attempting to exert over our domestic institutions. If they are candidates for suffering and martyrdom, why do they stand afar off and endeavor to implicate others in the condemnation of having in their hands seditious periodicals and tracts? Why do they seek to make others, who differ from them, unwilling partakers of their evil deeds? Why do they not, in person, test the operation of laws, which they profess to set at defiance? Why do they prostitute the columns of a periodical, purporting to be a messenger of peace and gospel truth, to the unhallowed uses of strife and sedition?”

“Differing from you, sir, in religious creed and order, I have no need of intelligence from the periodical of which you are editor at any time, but least of all when it contains an expression of your views in relation to slavery. I therefore beg that it may never be sent to me again, and enclose a copy of some resolutions passed at the late meeting of the Georgia Presbytery in this city, as the only adequate return I can make for your late communication: being, sir, your obedient servant,

“EDWD. NEUFVILLE.”

EXTRACT

From the Minutes of the Georgia Presbytery, at their late sessions in this city.

WHEREAS, an excitement has been raised by northern pretended philanthropists on a subject deeply interesting to every citizen and Christian in these United States, and especially so, to every individual in this section of our country; and whereas, many ministers at the north, calling themselves Presbyterians, have engaged in the crusade against our rights as citizens, and our privileges as Christians, to the prejudice of the good name of Presbyterians in the south; and whereas, this Presbytery consider this as an unrighteous interference with a subject with which they have no sort of business: wherefore,

Resolved, 1st, That this Presbytery have no common feelings with those men nor with their opinions, nor with their measures—that their conduct is abhorrent to us; and in the opinion of this Presbytery, in entire opposition to both the letter and spirit of the gospel.

Resolved, 2nd, That the Presbytery will countenance no minister, nor merchant, nor mechanic, nor any other man, come from whence he may, who holds the sentiments of a northern abolitionist; we may ever consider such as incendiaries, whatever may be their professions—the enemies of our country—the disturbers of our churches—the destroyers of our peace, of our families, and of all we hold dear.

Resolved, 3d, That we disapprove of the action of the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian church on the subject, so far as the appointment of a committee for its consideration, and we would earnestly beseech that committee and our next General

Assembly, to beware what they do, lest they bring about that in the church which threatens to be brought about in the State the separation of the north from the south.

Resolved, 4th, That our beloved southern Zion may calm their fears in regard to their ministers and elders—they reject the tenets and doctrines of abolition, and solemnly declare, for themselves and their churches, that they never were and never can be abolitionists.

Resolved, 5th, That while we thus freely express our sentiments on this exciting subject, we deprecate the proceedings of those who, contrary to all law, are punishing real or supposed offences, by the summary process of violence. While we condemn fanaticism in others, let us not become fanatics of an equally lawless kind ourselves. The Constitution of our country, and the laws of our land, are sufficient for our protection. We exhort our people, therefore, to support and maintain the majesty and supremacy of the laws, and to put down all who violate them, as equally dangerous to the peace and safety of the country as abolitionists themselves.

The above resolutions were passed by a unanimous vote.

H. S. PRATT, Stated Clerk.

Savannah, Nov. 5, 1835.

REMARKS.—We understand that the Rev. Horace S. Pratt, the stated clerk, and a native of Connecticut, is one of the largest slaveholders in Georgia; and we have never heard that he either furnishes his slaves with Bibles or preaches to them the duty of searching the Scriptures.

ANOTHER GEORGIA MINISTER.—This letter cost us but twenty-five cents.

AGUSTA, GA. Nov. 7, 1835.

SIR—I have this day received, through the post-office, “the Evangelist” of Oct. 31st. I presume the design in sending it, was to enlighten me by the account contained in it, of the proceedings of the late Anti-Slavery Convention at Utica, and the elaborate articles, original and selected, in defence of the nefarious designs of a band of the most mischievous and malignant fanatics that have ever constituted the scourge and the curse of any country. I have to request that I be favored with no more numbers of your mischievous paper. (An “Evangelist,” not of peace and good will, but of bloodshed and confusion!) I trust in God, sir, not only for the peace and security of that interesting portion of our country against which your machinations are pointed, but for your own safety, and that of your fellow-laborers in this cause, that you may yet be induced to listen to the voice of prudence at least, if not of reason and justice and humanity, before you pull down an awful destruction upon your heads, from an indignant community; aye, sir, and not this, but your own community whose sentiments and feelings have been so wantonly outraged, and whose forbearance, so honorable and so unprecedented, has been so shamefully sported with. As a minister of the gospel of peace, I feel myself under a solemn obligation to commit your bloody paper to the flames, as soon as perused—a destination which you may rest assured awaits as many more of them as you see fit to send, and that without being read at all.

Yours, &c.

EDWD. E. FORD.

ANOTHER SLAVEHOLDING MINISTER.—We mention to the credit of the writer of the following, that he paid his own postage, 18 cents. It was subscribed as follows:—“To Joshua Leavitt, called in New-York, the Rev. Joshua Leavitt, editor of a paper, nicknamed the New-York Evangelist, New-York.”

CAIRA, CUMBERLAND, VA. Nov. 1835.

SIR.—At different times, three copies of the New-York Evangelist, and one copy of the New-York Evening Post, have been sent to me, two of the former from your office, and one from Albany, bound up with a bundle of Temperance Society papers.

I have to inform you that the theology of the New-York Evangelist I regard with deep abhorrence. I am informed by the Presbyterian, that the New-York Evangelist and the New-York Evening Post, are abolition papers. I do not despise even popery itself quite as much as I do the opinions, schemes, plots, and operations of the abolitionists. These declarations, I should suppose, ought to be quite sufficient to give you a right broad hint, that I have no reliance at all for the new schoolism. If you were a man of any delicacy of sentiment and feeling, you would not have sent me another copy of your paper after I had sent back one without reading it. Now, as you have no modesty at all, I say to you, please, Rev. Mr. Joshua Leavitt, do not send me any more of your papers; please, do not force them down my throat, to whatever degree they may be nauseous to my stomach.

One hint more, and I am done with you. I do not regard new schoolism as the religion of the Bible; and I do not, and I cannot recognize abolitionists as ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

You are authorized, if it suits you, to have this letter inserted in every paper in New York, New England, Ohio, Kentucky, &c., and subscribed by

ROBERT N. ANDERSON.

Anti-Slavery Ecclesiastics.

SYNOD OF MICHIGAN